3 1761 07473576 2

THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE:

A Diocesan Charge.

A.D. 1880.

THE

CHURCH OF THE FUTURE

1. ITS CATHOLICITY
2. ITS CONFLICT WITH THE ATHEIST
3. ITS CONFLICT WITH THE DEIST
4. ITS CONFLICT WITH THE RATIONALIST
5. ITS DOGMATIC TEACHING
6. PRACTICAL COUNSELS FOR ITS WORK
7. ITS CATHEDRALS
8. APPENDICES

BY

ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL [Tait]

Archbishop of Canterbury

1143 5/6/11

NEW YORK

MACMILLAN AND CO.,

1881.

CONTENTS.

I.

PAGE

Its Catholicity 1

II.

Its Conflict with the Atheist 31

III.

Its Conflict with the Deist 57

IV.

Its Conflict with the Rationalist 87

V.

Its Dogmatic Teaching 114

VI.

Practical Counsels for its Work 139

VII.

PAGE
ADDRESS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CATHEDRAL BODY 167

VIII.

APPENDICES 203

THE

CHURCH OF THE FUTURE.

I.

ITS CATHOLICITY.

(*Delivered at Croydon, on August 31st, to the Rural Deaneries of Croydon, East Dartford, and West Dartford.*)

MY REVEREND BRETHREN, AND MY BRETHREN THE CHURCHWARDENS,—I have determined, under our peculiar circumstances, not to follow the usual arrangement of those episcopal charges which give special prominence to matters immediately concerning the diocese in which they are delivered. I have thought it best for several reasons to ask the clergy to send

in their returns to my visitation questions not before, but during the actual visitation; and I propose, according to my practice since I became Archbishop, to make the answers to these questions a subject of future private correspondence between myself and the clergy, rather than to incorporate the results of them in my charge.

The circumstances of this archiepiscopal diocese are altogether peculiar, and are becoming every year more so. I do not know how it will ever be possible hereafter for an Archbishop of Canterbury to dispense with such assistance as has now for many years been kindly and efficiently given both to you and to me by the Suffragan Bishop of Dover. Every year Lambeth is becoming more and more a centre to which the whole Anglican communion directly looks; and that communion seems to me to be more and more every year becoming itself a centre for all the Churches of Christendom which protest against Roman usurpation. The result is that the work of the Primacy, as

distinguished from the work of the Diocesan Bishop of Canterbury, is every year greatly increasing. There are at least 162 bishops of the English, or Anglican, communion with dioceses scattered throughout the world, and, with all of these, more or less, I find it necessary to be in communication. You are aware that two years ago one hundred of these fathers of the Church gathered at Lambeth for a month's deliberation; and you will remember the expressions of filial regard with which that great assembly of bishops met to worship in our metropolitical cathedral at Canterbury, and called to mind the associations which bound them to the birthplace of what we commonly call Anglo-Saxon Christianity. I shall have to mention to you hereafter some of the important results of that episcopal gathering, felt both here at home and in the remotest regions where our English tongue is spoken. These, you will readily believe, are not brought to accomplishment without much labour. There is necessarily much communication between the Bishops of India and the

colonies and the chief guiding authorities of our own Church at home. And our brethren of the United States of America have, ever since Archbishop Longley's wise resolve to invite them to the first conference at Lambeth, so far thrown in their lot with us that their work and ours has become more directly intertwined by distinct relations of friendship and co-operation. Moreover, the generation in which we live has awakened to a more real understanding than its predecessor of the force of the German proverb—that "behind the hills (and we may add beyond the seas) there are people," Christian people, with an old descent, quite unconnected in their origin with either Rome or Canterbury—with the same episcopal form of government as ourselves, cherishing the old liturgies, which are the basis of our Common Prayer—Christians who have maintained their faith through long centuries of oppression, whose trials have been such as we Englishmen, thank God, have never been exposed to, and who at the present day stretch out their hands to

England with an earnestness of supplication inspired by a confidence of help unknown in former times.

Let mere worldly politicians dispute as to the wisdom or unwisdom of England's undertaking great responsibilities to help the distressed, and extend the blessings of civilisation through the suffering tribes in those dark regions in Asia, in which practically there is no law and no justice, no liberty, and no security of property, or even life — we English Churchmen can have no doubt of our duty as Christians to do all in our power to remedy these detestable evils, when they are brought distinctly to our notice. The Churches of the East, one after another—Syrian, Armenian, Chaldean, Nestorian — implore our aid. The boon asked of us by some of these communities, is that we give them help to raise themselves by education, and secure for them that respect from their persecutors which they believe the very name of a connection with England will insure. Blessed fruit of that great position to which the kindness of our God has

raised our nation, that even in these remote regions the public opinion of Christian England is not without its force; and that people who are known to have a clergyman of the English Church among them feel nearly as secure as if they were under the protection of some regular emissary of the English State! As a matter of fact, scarcely a week passes without some touching appeal reaching Lambeth from these distressed Oriental Christians. No wide-spread spiritual work, testifying to our Christian brotherhood, has yet been done among them but by the missionaries of the American Independents. All honour to these good men for the efforts they have steadily pursued for so many years, to the quiet efficacy of which testimony is borne by the authorities of our Foreign Office. Besides our intercourse with the comparatively small Oriental Churches or sects of which we have spoken, we have growing relations also with the great divisions of the Greek Church in Russia, in Turkey, and in Greece—with the partially independent Bulgarian Greek Church, and

with the Coptic Church of Egypt and Abyssinia. There is also that large body of native Christians unconnected with Rome, on the coast of Malabar, which has long claimed the interest and the sympathy of our missionaries in India.

But why do I recount the names of all these Eastern Churches, some of which are comparatively little known? Not only to let you understand how the circle of our Church's influence is widening, but also that I may press upon you the duty of carefully considering their claims. It is right, as I have often said before, that we should have in every parish some organization to promote our missionary work among the heathen, and we call to mind with thankfulness how our great Church societies have helped forward the efforts which England is bound to make to spread the Gospel in lands where Christ is utterly unknown. England has its commercial and colonizing relations with every part of the globe, and Englishmen cannot escape from the responsibility of sending the knowledge

of Christian truth to those who lie in utter darkness. Our great societies, as I have said, such as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society, are the true handmaids of our Church in this portion of its work—and one or other, if not both, of these societies, I consider that every earnest-minded Churchman is bound directly to support according to his means. But in our zeal for the heathen we are not to overlook our fellow-Christians. The Roman Catholic Church, indeed, separates itself from us by so sharp a line of arrogant exclusiveness, built on a superstructure of false doctrine, that our hopes of influencing it must be very slight unless some fundamental change be made in its whole system. But these Oriental Christians show a lively interest in our co-operation, and have of late years expressed their desire to know more of us, and to act with us in a fraternal spirit. We shall do well then, to support the efforts of which Lambeth is in a sort the centre, for encouraging such attempts to foster

a truer brotherhood between ourselves and these scattered Christian communities.

Not that we are to neglect our duties to our Roman Catholic brethren, or to those who are labouring to free themselves from the Roman yoke. Public attention has been much directed of late years to the German and Swiss movement of those who, having joined the old Jansenist Community of Holland in resisting the new Vatican decrees, claim for themselves the name of Old Catholics; and the English Church looks with sympathy and interest to the result of this movement But not in Germany and Switzerland alone are there symptoms of a revolt against undue Papal pretensions. Many of you are aware that our sister Church in the United States has lately availed itself of the peculiar condition of affairs in Mexico to foster there an independent Spanish-speaking Church, which in the towns at least of that country has made rapid progress among those who before had little choice left to them except between

infidelity and a very debased form of Romanism. The conference of bishops at Lambeth heard the account of this movement, as well as of that in the small Republic of Hayti, with deep interest; and, as representations had been made from Spain that there were many earnest Christians there, desiring to avail themselves of the new-born religious liberty of their country, the assembled bishops gave their sanction to the extension of the Mexican movement from America to the mother country from which Mexico derived its Christianity. Bishop Riley, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Mexico, a man who has the singular advantage, from his birth and education, of being equally well versed in the English and in the Spanish languages, has just returned from his visit to the congregations of protesting Christians in Spain and Portugal, and reports that there is good hope of a real and widely-spread work of reformation, under Protestant episcopal auspices, in these countries. In France, where Ultramontane Romanism holds scarcely disputed sway as the national protest

against infidelity, such efforts are naturally small, and, as yet, feeble. But I cannot doubt that we are right to give the sanction of our help to individual priests who, amid a thousand difficulties, are feeling their way to a purer form of the old Gallican national Church. I do not think that such efforts will in any way interfere with the progress of French Protestantism, in which England is so much interested, and with which the Cathedral and Diocese of Canterbury maintain a historical connection. These various efforts after internal reform in the several Churches greatly increase our responsibilities, and I commend them to the careful attention of all true-hearted English Churchmen. The time has gone by when we could rest contented in our insular position.

I have spoken hitherto of those who are united with us in the episcopal form of government. But I suppose we none of us forget how much the Church of England owes in its formularies to the Augsburg Confession, and how little chance there would have been, humanly

speaking, of the Reformation spreading with power if God had not raised up its champion in Luther. Neither are we forgetful how, in the persecution under Mary Tudor, our true-hearted Reformers found a refuge in Switzerland till the tyranny was overpast, nor how there has ever been, since those days, a bond of cordial union, independent of outward forms, uniting the wisest spirits of the Church of England with the literary and theological labours of German, French, and Swiss Protestants. We may speak of an anticipated union with distant Oriental Christians, but these men are our brethren already, learning from our teaching as we learn from theirs, united with us in the acceptance of those great truths of the freedom of the Gospel, which they and we, notwithstanding all our differences, national and ecclesiastical, have alike derived from dwelling on the writings and imbibing the spirit of St. Paul. The Swedish Lutheran Church, it is well known, claims to live under the same outward government as our own; and the great Moravian body, spread

through Germany and known throughout the world by its missionary efforts among the heathen, makes a like claim. The boundaries of separation, then, between us and Continental Protestants who hold fast by the fundamentals of the Gospel, fade to an indistinct line; and shall we not, from our necessary connection with these, learn many lessons to guide us in our dealings with our nonconforming brethren at home and their representatives in the United States of America? In fact, it will be our fault if the great Protestant communities throughout the world, episcopal and non-episcopal, which adhere to the apostolic faith, do not feel that their cause is indissolubly united with our own.

At home, important questions of policy may keep us apart. Certainly it is our duty to resist all efforts for subverting that national constitution of our Church, which makes it the authorised teacher of all our people, and the mouthpiece through which our common Christianity speaks in all our public acts as

a State. Also, it is impossible to have a near union of worship and teaching with those who altogether repudiate our forms of prayer and of Church government, and look upon many of the statements made by our Church as superstitious and ungodly. But not the less is it our duty, where we can, to cultivate friendly relations with them, and draw them to us, by the manifestation of a real Christian spirit, while we look out for occasions on which notwithstanding our differences, we may act together for the spiritual good of the nations. The Church of Christ throughout the world would, it must be remembered, be deprived of a vast proportion of its worshippers, if we left out of sight our Christian brotherhood with non-episcopal congregations at home, and the overwhelming mass of such congregations

[1] I have myself been for thirty years a member of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which enables Churchmen and Dissenters so to co-operate in the great work of circulating the word of God. The Society contains among its vice-presidents the names of some forty Bishops of the Church of England.

in the United States of America. Thus I trust we English Churchmen are learning more and more to realise once again that great idea which was so powerful of old to stir men's hearts and make them help each other—that there is a vast community cemented by Christian faith and principle, which, amid all national and other special differences, joins together the whole body of those who worship God in Christ.

I would here remark, in connection with this subject, that what is commonly called the Oxford revival of forty or fifty years ago conferred many benefits on English society. Not only do we owe to it a more reverent appreciation of the value of the outward forms of religion, but it greatly changed that large section of the clergy who, ever since the days of the Commonwealth, have inherited a horror of Puritanism, and who, under recent teaching, have risen from the careless indifference which characterised their predecessors to a rigid observance of the duties of their sacred

calling. Still more, there can be no doubt that, uniting good taste with genuine Christian feeling, this revival laid hold of the imagination of many ardent and highly cultivated young men who have since risen to important public positions, and under its guidance have exercised a lasting Christian influence on our whole nation. Still I think this must be granted on the other hand—that the teaching thus introduced or resuscitated, notwithstanding all its claims to Catholicity, was and is based on a somewhat narrow system, and has confined Churchmen's sympathies in the direction in which before they were ready to expand. My predecessors in the Episcopate had, I think, less difficulty than we should experience nowadays in welcoming the co-operation of such men as was Robert Hall in the days of our fathers, and wishing them God-speed in their labours to resist prevailing infidelity. Let me note here that the passing of the Lord Chancellor's Burials Bill has been looked forward to by some of us as likely, not only

to put an end to a painful controversy, but also to have something of a healing effect in reference to the general relations of Churchmen and Nonconformists, as it certainly has been the desire of those who have supported the measure to make it contain concessions to the claims of both sides in the controversy. How far this charitable wish may be fulfilled is of course uncertain; but I am very confident that the good feeling of the majority of our clergy, when a certain amount of soreness, not unnaturally engendered by the controversy, has passed, will lead them fairly and generously to endeavour to secure whatever good in this respect the measure may be capable of producing. The existence of dissent from the National Church is a fact which we cannot overlook. We deplore it, but we cannot act as if there were no such thing in the land as dissent on the part of good men; and I am sure that we all feel it our duty to meet the inevitable state of circumstances in which we find ourselves in a tolerant,

Christian spirit. After all, it is something to live in a country the whole inhabitants of which, speaking roughly, acknowledge one Lord and Saviour, and refer to one Bible as the one accredited rule of their life and citizenship.

I cannot help here remarking what an evidence to a real and wide-spread Catholicity is afforded by the hymns which we use in public worship. The strains in which we Church of England people sing God's praises are drawn from the most diverse sources. We hear in them the ever-living voices of early Christian fathers, of mediæval saints, of Lutheran reformers, of some modern Roman Catholics, and of many English and American Nonconformists. These all unite with our own Church's poets and divines of every school in raising our thoughts in our holiest moments to the throne of God.[1] An outward unity is indeed much to be desired, but we must not sacrifice too much to it, or neglect, because of our points of differ-

[1] See Appendix A.

ence, whatever may unite us with all who hold fast by the faith of the Apostolic and Nicene Creeds. For myself, in the office which, in the providence of God, I have held now for nearly twelve years, I have certainly never experienced any unwillingness, on the part of our countrymen without our pale, to pay to the Church of England that deference which all Protestant Christendom awards it, as the chief bulwark of the reformed faith against the assaults, on one side, of superstition, and, on the other, of an aggressive infidelity.

From what I have said, you will, I think, grant that I am justified in regarding it as my duty, in a solemn address from this chair, to speak of things which concern the whole Church of Christ, and not to confine our view too much to the separate interests of our own diocese, or even to our own English branch of the Church universal. But before I go into the questions concerning the Church of Christ in general, to which I hope to direct much of what I have to address to you at the several stations of my

progress through the diocese, it will naturally be expected that I should say something as to the present position of our own Church, in reference to controversies which have of late much agitated it, and have given occasion to our adversaries to look upon us with scorn. I am thankful to say that I believe the agitations of the past years are subsiding, and that our Church may now soon be allowed to brace itself with undivided energy to the great conflict of these latter days. Sad, indeed, if souls should be perishing around us while we are engaged in conflicts about mint, and anise, and cumin! The Mutines of Jerusalem fought with one another within the walls, and the enemy stormed their gates. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I trust we are coming to the end of our late unhappy divisions within our own Church. It is commonly said that the Public Worship Regulation Act has altogether failed of its purpose. I must be allowed, as its chief promoter, to say that this is not so. Those who make such a statement do not

rightly apprehend what its purpose was. Its promoters never desired that it should produce a crop of convictions and of punishments inflicted upon wrong-headed, conscientious men. What they desired was to put a stop to a state of things—common and growing six years ago—by which every raw theologian, visiting Belgium or some other neighbouring Roman Catholic country, came back laden with a crop of very doubtful innovations, which he sought to introduce into his own parish as an improvement on the authorised mode of worship, to the great annoyance and scandal of his sober-minded parishioners. I think we may congratulate ourselves that this state of things has come to an end. The voice of the nation, tested in Parliament by the introduction of the measure I have alluded to, has proved itself, in this repect, to be the voice of the Church as well as the voice of the nation. We desired, by the provisions of the measure, both as it was at first devised by the bishops, and also as it was finally carried in Parliament, to place in the hands of the

bishops the controlling power as to whether or no a new practice might innocently be introduced consistently with the spirit and teaching of the Church. Some had advocated that there ought to be no changes under any circumstances from the established usage of each parish ; but this, we saw, would be fatal to the desirable progress of improvement in many parishes, and in others would secure an immunity for unauthorised and dangerous alterations in the form of worship sanctioned by the Prayer-Book, if they had already been introduced. It was hoped, indeed, that a ready and inexpensive method of applying the law of the Church when necessary had been secured, and no doubt this was done by the simplifying of process and the limitation of the number of Courts through which a trial can go, and by dispensing with any necessity for the intervention of counsel or proctors in the conduct of a case. Experience, however, has proved that no precautions can prevent an undue expenditure both of time and money, when excited

partisans are determined to call to their aid the first lawyers of the day, and contest every inch of ground. There have been very few trials under the Public Worship Regulation Act—about six in all, in six years; but the effect of these, even where unforeseen difficulties have intervened, has been to make otherwise thoughtless persons think twice before they embroil themselves in all the difficulties which the commencement of a suit would necessarily throw in the way of their highest spiritual usefulness in their parishes. The Act was acceptable to the laity of the Church, because it recognised distinctly their right to be heard in matters concerning the common worship of their parish churches; and yet it left with the bishops, as guardians of the rights both of laity and clergy, the duty of controlling and rejecting all vexatious and unnecessary complaints. I would call attention to the fact that the last decision on appeal, from a case not commenced under the Public Worship Regulation Act, has confirmed the bishop in

the possession of a similar discretion in all cases.[1]

With the bishops, then, according both to the old and the new process for securing uniformity of worship, it now rests to determine, in every case of complaint, what degree of departure from the letter of the law of the Church is not inconsistent with loyal adhesion to the spirit of that law, and what innovations go beyond the boundary. No clergyman can, in such cases, be prosecuted, unless he has deliberately resolved to repudiate the authority of his bishop. The old theory of the Church of England, as embodied in our rubrics, contemplates the reference of all such cases to the decision of the bishop; and to the calm decisions of the bishops exercising a discretion secured to them by law, the overwhelming majority of Churchmen are ready to submit. It is to be noted that, as might be expected,

[1] See the judgment of the House of Lords, in the case of Julius *v.* The Bishop of Oxford and Another, delivered March 23rd, 1880.

the hundred bishops assembled at Lambeth two years ago, representing a great variety of opinions, and with various prepossessions, agreed that such deference to the constituted authority of each diocese was essential to an Episcopal Church. Their resolution was to the following effect:—"Considering unhappy disputes on questions of ritual, whereby divers congregations in the Church of England and elsewhere have been seriously disquieted, your committee (and the assembled bishops adopted the decision) desire to affirm the principle that no alteration from long-accustomed ritual should be made contrary to the admonition of the bishop of the diocese."[1] And subsequently both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, following previous resolutions from both Canterbury[2] and York,[3] adopted[4] a like resolution. Wherever, then, the Church has spoken, the solution of the difficulty has been

[1] See the official "Letter" of the Lambeth Conference, 1878, p. 40.

[2] Feb. 15th, 1867.

[3] March 20th, 1867.

[4] July 4th, 1879.

the same, and this solution has now received the sanction both of the legislature and of the highest judicial tribunal. We have then, a doubly authoritative answer to the question—How are the clergy at once to have pressed upon them the duty of a loyal obedience to the Acts of Uniformity and other laws regulating Church affairs, and at the same time to be allowed such liberty in the letter of obedience as the peculiar circumstances of their parishes seem to require? The oft-quoted words of the Preface to the Prayer-Book had long ago laid down that "forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same, to appease all such diversity, if any arise, and for the resolution of all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in this Book, the parties that so doubt or diversely take anything shall always resort to the bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that

the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book. And if the bishop of the diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the archbishop." And, as we have seen, the spirit of this determination has now been formally embodied in the resolutions of the hundred bishops at Lambeth, and of the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, as well as in the decisions of the highest court of the realm. The result thus arrived at has appeared to Churchmen of various shades of opinion so consonant with Church principles, that we have before us the example of one of the most devoted and widely respected leaders of that section of the Church which has given its special attention to the claims of what is called "Catholic ritual," publicly acquiescing in the decision of his bishop, though at the sacrifice of retiring from a field of labour which was very dear to him. The clergy of the English Church have ever, in times past, been distinguished for their loyalty, their

devotion to the laws and constitution of the well-ordered Church and realm to which they are proud to belong, and their willingness to sacrifice their individual tastes and opinions, if need be, to the maintenance of good order and good government. In this respect the best sons of our Church in the present day are not below their fathers. Some may prolong strife by raising objections to the authority of the courts which have interpreted the laws of the Church. But even these must soon retire from their totally untenable position, when they are forced to acknowledge that, whatever they may think of the decisions of any court—secular, ecclesiastical, or mixed — it is with their bishops, to whom they have sworn canonical obedience, that they have to reckon in their controversy; and, moreover, that the authority of the diocesan bishop in such cases, has been affirmed by the assembly of a hundred bishops at Lambeth and by the constitutional synod of the province. A few other unquiet spirits, whose tendencies are all in another direction,

may still long for strife. There are fanatics who desire to be imprisoned as martyrs, and foolish opponents of those persons, who would seek to gratify their thirst for an easy martyrdom. But most wise men will prefer to trust to the slow, it may be, but steady working out of the Church's laws in its own way. There are those, no doubt, who, feeling dissatisfied with the moderation sure to characterise the decisions of the bishops, and tired of waiting till the law takes its course, may agitate for some reversal of the existing law. But I think I am not too sanguine in believing that the overwhelming majority of Churchmen are tired and ashamed of such disputes, and are thankful they are dying out; that our people desire a well-ordered, hearty, and attractive ritual, but are perfectly staunch in their dislike of semi-Romish innovations, deeply attached both to the forms and doctrines of the Church to which they belong, and thankful that these are being quietly, though it may be slowly, enforced. Happy indeed will it be for the bishops

of the present generation, if, in spite of the innumerable misrepresentations to which they have been exposed, they shall be proved to have been able, through the exercise of a kindly moderating authority, to close those disputes which at one time seemed likely to rend our Church asunder, and if, under their guidance, Churchmen may now direct their thoughts, undistracted, to the real work of their Master, in edifying the souls of the faithful, by dwelling on the central doctrines of the Gospel, in converting sinners, and in resisting the progress of viciousness and unbelief.

II.

ITS CONFLICT WITH THE ATHEIST.

(*Delivered at Tunbridge, on September 3rd, to the Rural Deaneries of North Malling, South Malling, Tunbridge, and Shoreham.*)

MY REVEREND BRETHREN AND MY BRETHREN THE CHURCHWARDENS,—In my visitation address delivered last Tuesday at Croydon, I endeavoured to set forth how the Church of England of the present day must be world-wide in its sympathies, and that it has peculiar advantages, involving peculiar responsibilities, in reference to the evils which in this age afflict the Church of Christ in all lands. The peculiar errors, both in doctrine and in practice, with which the Church of

Christ has to contend elsewhere, are, in their degree powerfully at work amongst ourselves. Therefore it cannot be right for an English bishop, still less for one holding my position, when addressing his diocese on so important an occasion as a visitation, to confine his vision to petty and passing disputes of a narrow ecclesiasticism, or a narrow theology.

I think we are bound at the present moment to look steadily at the Church's mission in its full extensiveness. There can be no doubt that the aspect of Christian society in the present day is somewhat troubled; that the Church of Christ and the faith of Christ are passing through a great trial in all regions of the civilized world, and not least among ourselves. There are dark clouds on the horizon already breaking, which may speedily burst into a violent storm. What would be said if, through our weakness, we should give to those who are banded together to resist or ignore Christianity, the encouragement always secured for an advancing foe, when those who have

to repel the onset are blind to the greatness of the real danger, and occupied with frivolous disputes on minor matters among themselves. Many questions, both important and unimportant, about which Christian men may differ, can afford to wait for their settlement till formidable dangers, threatening the whole Church, are overpast.

I proceed, therefore, to consider some of the phases of that conflict for which the Church universal must brace itself in this nineteenth century. Let us be thankful if we can feel ourselves members of a compact, well-ordered section of that Church, strengthened by ennobling traditions of its past history, holding fast by the teaching of the Apostles, and ready to adapt itself, in its maintenance of truth and holiness, to the ever-varying circumstances of the changing ages. Many expect that, as the world grows old, and the coming of the Lord draws near, there will be some conflict betwixt truth and falsehood, greater perhaps than has ever been known

before. However this may be, it is certain that each age of the Church must expect its own great difficulties. History tells us how error has assumed its own peculiar form in each century. I can have little doubt what is for us the impending controversy. Superstition may for a time raise its head, and does raise it in a strange and unexpected fashion in some of the countries of Europe, attracting numbers as if it were the only antidote to infidelity, instead of being, as I believe it is, the handmaid of the same evil influence. Men will never be cured of believing too little by unscrupulous attempts to involve them in believing too much. Reason will never be effectually restrained from wandering into the vague and doubtful, by unauthorised claims to settle every controversy by authority, and to forbid the exercise of God's great gift of reason, as if to think for ourselves, and follow the dictates of conscience, were a sin. It is well to note in history how these two evils, superstition and infidelity, act and react in strengthening each

other. Still, I cannot doubt that the most formidable of the two for us at present is infidelity.

It is natural, as life wanes, that we should all look forward. What, then, will be the religion, or if religion, as some wildly suppose, were to be driven from our land, what will be the philosophy of those who stand in our place when we are gone? To judge by the loud and unscrupulous talk of some, you might think that we are fast being prepared for acquiescence in a materialistic atheism. I have no fear that this scourge will desolate our land. It is, indeed, a frightful thought that numbers of our intelligent mechanics seem to be alienated from all religious ordinances, that there are in some of our towns secularist halls well filled, that there is an active propagandism at work for shaking belief in all creeds. Marvellous that those who see vividly, in their own painful experience, how unequally good things are distributed in this life, and how much there is always in it of poverty and misery,

nothwithstanding all attempts to regenerate society by specious schemes of socialistic reorganisation, should be willing to confine their hopes and aspirations to a life which is so irresistibly hastening to its speedy conclusion, and which leaves so little time for any one, even the most favoured of human beings, to enjoy that share of good things which this world can secure for him. It is certain also that, from above, in the regions of literature and of art, efforts to degrade mankind, by denying our high destination, and extinguishing the brightest of our hopes, have much encouragement.

It is a peculiarity of our time that in every household in England, which cultivates an acquaintance with the literature of the day, we find lying on our tables, for the use of our sons and daughters, magazines, in the pages of which the doctrines both of natural and revealed religion are assailed. Such publications are placed within our reach at every railway station. No doubt it is urged in defence of these publications that they

are open to both sides—that if they convey the poison they also convey the antidote, and that good results from this system to the cause of orthodoxy, because many persons who might otherwise never read any literature which was not of a sceptical character, will find within the pages of such books sound treatises advocating old truths, and will thus have good thoughts forced on their attention. But, obviously, there are two sides to this argument, and it may be that the system of which we are speaking has a tendency to lead the uninformed to regard all questions as open, and truth as very doubtful. It cannot, I think, but be allowed that this peculiarity of our periodical literature is a symptom of dangerous influences at work, even if it does not foster them.

What shall we say, then, is the form which this evil influence most commonly assumes? Is it simply sceptical, throwing doubt on all things? Or does it, under a specious show of having proved the doubtfulness of things spiritual, proceed to dogmatise respecting

things material, as the sole, real, and valuable inheritance of man?

First, agnosticism. What is it? Its name announces that it knows nothing. Would that its professions of ignorance were accompanied by their logical result of a philosophical humility! An agnostic, I take it, is one who says, "I know nothing of things spiritual and metaphysical. You tell me that there is a world beyond the grave, and that there is something within me which is destined to live in that world, when all the material objects, of whose existence alone I can be certain, have crumbled into dust; you tell me old stories of men believing that they had intercourse in time past with a spiritual being, who dwells somewhere above the clouds. I know nothing which is capable of corroborating such fancies. Why am I not to regard them as the dreams of a heated imagination? I want something certain, and I find this certainty only in the physical phenomena around me, and in the unchanging laws of outward nature. It is just possible that

there may be some truth in your vague imaginings, but I cannot ascertain it, and therefore, for all practical purposes, I shall consider them to be but vain. Life, with its enjoyments and pursuits, as I see and feel them, is full of interest; but what I was before I came into this world concerns me little, and as little am I concerned respecting anything that can hereafter befall the particles of which I am composed. You say there is a Supreme Intelligence, animated by a Father's love, which regulates all things. I see no proof of it. The laws of nature roll on with iron uniformity. Whoever tries to act against them is crushed by their irresistible advance." I do not say that the agnostic argues like some Epicureans—"Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die"—but, as I understand him, he speaks thus—"Let us confine our thoughts to what we are certain of. Let us conform ourselves to the irresistible course of this all-pervading machinery, of which we find ourselves a part. Let us make the most of our present material existence. We

can do no better; and attempts to act as if we knew more than we do will only make things worse. Priests and so-called theological philosophers, all the world over, have only been misleading us. They might, perhaps, have their place in the world's childhood, when men were incapable of a training in the rules and operations of an exact and positive philosophy; but the world has come to its manhood now, or is fast approaching it. I know," says this modern philosopher, "nothing but what I can observe and classify, and I take no interest in your theologies and vain philosophies."

The better feelings of man contradict these sophisms. An eminent Protestant pastor told me lately, in Paris, that, being called to conduct funeral rites in most of the cemeteries of that capital, he had made a point of inquiring of the custodians of these grounds as to the relative number of religious and of civil, that is, non-religious, funerals, and that he was assured that the civil funerals reached a scarcely appre-

ciable per-centage.[1] France has usually been regarded as the stronghold of an atheistical philosophy. Perhaps the claim to this pre-eminence may be disputed now by some other continental countries, but the fact of which I was thus assured is worth dwelling on. It seems to show one of two things, either that theories of atheistic scepticism, though they may satisfy some minds and make them altogether indifferent in life, are rudely shaken when the great and undeniable fact of death casts its shadow over the human soul: that lingering hopes and fears, against which the so-called philosopher had striven, assert themselves irresistibly in the presence of this great emergency; or this at least it proves, that in every family those who are influenced by such hopes and fears, though they may be but the frailer of its members, assert their power in times of mourning, strong in the promptings of nature, and determined not to be overborne by the pratings of a cold-hearted would-be-philosophic

[1] See Appendix B.

few. I think we may take some encouragement from the report thus made, that this atheistical scepticism is neither so widely spread nor so powerful as some fear.

Secondly, if the world is not about to become agnostic, certainly there is little fear of its falling under the dominion of an atheism which is dogmatic. Practical atheists we have everywhere, if atheism be the virtual denial of God in conduct though not in words. But surely the boasted enlightenment of this century will never tolerate the gross ignorance, the arrogant self-conceit, which presumes to dogmatise as to things confessedly beyond its ken, and boldly asserts because it cannot see God that therefore He is not. A coarse materialism which tells a man, because he is not conscious in himself of any stirring of spiritual life within him, that he may boldly deny the existence of all spirit, and professes to know that which its very theory proclaims to be unknowable, will surely never make progress amongst any but the most debased and

ignorant, in an age which prides itself on testing everything by experiment, and on not stirring one step beyond the calm convictions which an inquiring reason sanctions.

But, if we do not fear either of these antagonists, this is no reason why we should not call to mind sound arguments, many of them very old and very commonplace, but not therefore the less forcible, whereby we may withstand these baneful influences, and thus hope to avert the ruin which they may bring on the unwary. Say to the objector—"You profess, as I understand you, to believe nothing which is not capable of being tested by the ordinary rules which govern experiment in things material. How then do you know that you yourself exist? How do you know that the perceptions of your senses are not mere delusions, and that there is anything without you answering to what your mind conceives? I ask you further, Have you a mind? and if you have not, what is it that enables you to think and reason,

and fear, and hope? Are these conditions of your being the mere results of your material organism, like the headache which springs from indigestion, or the high spirits engendered by too much wine? Are you something better than a vegetable highly cultivated, or than your brothers of the lower animals? and if so, what is it that differentiates your superiority? Why do things without you obey your will? Have you a will? and, if so, what is it? I think you must allow that intellect is a thing almost divine, if there be anything divine; and I think also you must allow that it is not a thing to be propagated as we propagate well-made and high-bred cattle. Whence came Alexander the Great? whence Charlemagne? whence the First Napoleon? Was it through mere accident or spontaneous generation that they sprung up to alter by their genius and overwhelming will the destinies of the world? Whence came Homer, Shakespeare, Bacon? Whence came all the great historians? Whence came Plato

and all the bright lights of divine philosophy, of oratory, of poetry? Their influence, after all, you must allow to be quite as wide and as enduring as any influences which are the direct product of those positive material sciences which you worship. Do you think that all these great minds—for they are minds, and their work was not the mere product of a highly organized material frame—were the outcome of some system of material generation, which your so-called science can subject to rule, and teach men how to produce by growth as they grow vegetables? Nay, will you venture to deny that in the lives and teaching of all the great men who have swayed the world, including the leaders in your own field of science, there has been evidence of some divine intention calling them into being, preserving them amid the accidents and difficulties of life till they had accomplished the purposes for which that Divine Intelligence had shaped them? To sum up: We challenge these reasoners to look at facts,

which they pride themselves on taking for their guide,—the fact that they live; the fact that they trust the perceptions of their senses; the facts of the world's history and of the way in which mind, and not body, has dominated it; the fact that no knowledge of the wisest among us can even approach to the solution of this mystery of the power of mind; and we call on them, upon their own principles, to abandon their materialistic theories, and to worship an Intelligence, higher than their own, which pervades all things and regulates all things, and has stamped upon their very nature the acceptance of certain principles which they could not gain for themselves and cannot test by experience.

Again, on the hard ground of strictest logical argumentation, we challenge these men to give any intelligible account of how this bright world and all that lives in it came into existence without the action of a great first cause, that is, God. Do you say it was evolved in the lapse of countless ages? I ask you, as

you have been asked a hundred times before, evolved from what, and how? If human life be the refined product of a thousand evolutions from the original protoplasm, how was the protoplasm endowed with this power of an almost endless fecundity? You gain nothing by driving your hypothesis back through the dark mists of an unknown antiquity—at last you must come to something which could not generate itself and endow itself with marvellous powers. You may mount your world upon an elephant, and your elephant upon a tortoise, and invent as many inferior animals as you please for the tortoise to ride upon; but at last you must come to something which has in itself the power of supporting itself, and that something must be God. No one has ever yet been able to refute the old argument necessitating a great First Cause. And, if there be such a Cause, it is the Author of our being, and it must be by the will of this Cause that through whatever length of time, and amidst whatever changes, the

world and all that it inhabit and the whole material universe have sprung into being. If there be such a Cause is it possible to divest yourself of the conviction that this First Cause is something not akin to the mere material frame, whose development has sprung from a power imparted by this Cause? You may object to the phrase, as too figurative, that "God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life and he became a living soul;" but you cannot, I think, on your own principles, escape from the inference, logically deduced, that in some one or other of its forms, however long ago, this whole material system, in whatever primitive and undeveloped form it then existed, was, if we may not say breathed upon, at least influenced and directed and endowed with new powers by an eternal and self-existing mind. And if such a mind was in existence at the first, do you suppose it died or fell asleep when it had fashioned and wound up the material machine? A self-existing and eternal mind; how can it know death, or anything akin to

death? The Lord from whom creation springs at first must be its Lord ever. He may, or may not, put forth His powers in the direct regulation of its processes, but these powers, almighty and omnipresent, if eternal, must exist for ever; and God, being the Creator of the universe once, must, if there is any meaning in the terms by which we strive to express His existence, be ever Lord of it. Moreover, if, in all sincerity, the man of science, who is guided by real facts, must allow that in man there is a mind as well as a body, this mind, at however vast a distance it may be placed from its original, and however faint its resemblance, must have something within it akin to that mind by which it was generated. It must be more like the Eternal Mind than the body is, for it has this in common with the Eternal Mind, that it thinks and wills. May I not believe that you will grant so much as this? Will your experimental philosophers refuse to take cognisance of what the strictest observation shows to be

the almost universal characteristics of the human mind—its hopes, its fears, its bright imaginings, its sense of right and wrong, feeble at first, but proved by experience to be capable of development, and therefore existing in its rudimentary state even where inactive? Man has something within him which speaks of God, of something above this fleeting world; and rules of right and wrong have their foundation elsewhere than in man's opinion. Do not tell me that in the savage these powers are scarcely perceptible—no more perceptible is his power of understanding the propositions of Euclid; yet he must have by nature some power of understanding them, however latent and undeveloped. Had he not such a power within him, not all your education could ever make him understand them. The savage has an intellect, even when it is least instructed, and he has a conscience, too, even when it knows least of God and of right and wrong. Let the experimental philosopher, then, look to the nature of man, not the undeveloped nature of the child or the

savage, but that matured nature which Bishop Butler considers the model of the real man, and therefore the specimen of what he is in truth. Let him observe the facts of human nature and listen to its utterances, and he will find all things proclaiming that there is some immutable eternal distinction between right and wrong; that there is a God who is on the side of right, that man is not a mere material body, but is animated by a spirit within; that this spirit has in it longings and capacities which cannot be satisfied in the brief space of seventy years—that he is made for immortality, and is assured that he is immortal. Are these very old arguments? Well, they are the answers to very old errors, and old errors do not become new by being expressed here and there in new language, and by the array of any number of new facts, on the misinterpretation of which they strive to ground their claims to be believed as truths. I take it that the old writers, heathen, Jewish, and Christian, have, in truth, exhausted the arguments on this very old subject, and that they are not wrong in

their conclusion that it is not the wise man or the true philosopher and man of science, but his reverse, who says in his heart "There is no God." Great is truth, and will prevail.

I do not fear, then, that either an atheistical agnosticism, or still less a dogmatic atheism, is the philosophy of the future, destined to establish itself, as it wildly hopes, on the ruins of the Church of Christ. The only fear I have is that before such systems are smitten by the sword of sound argument, and ignominiously driven forth by the revolt against them of all man's higher feelings, they may do much harm to unstable souls. How shall we prevent this? Sound arguments must be at hand and easily found by those who have the skill to use them. But there is always some attraction in daring speculations which treat contemptuously time-honoured convictions, and try every art to invest themselves with an air of ingenuity and novelty. The best safeguard will be found in the development of the soul's highest and most God-like instincts; and, thank God, we Christians believe that in an attempt

to cherish and train these we have the aid of a power which is Divine. This power will help Christ's servants in their endeavour to fan the Divine spark which is to be found in every human soul, and to kindle from it a light which will preserve the soul from walking in darkness and guide it in the search after truth and holiness.

My brethren of the clergy, you will be watchful for your people in this matter, especially for the young of your flocks, for poison is widely disseminated among them, and must be met by an antidote. My brethren of the laity, you will be on your guard also, both for yourselves and for the younger and more easily impressible members of your families. This Church of ours in this age has great responsibilities, and needs much wisdom and discretion, in respect both of the intellectual speculation, and the moral conduct of the coming age. Do not suppose that in setting forth the trite arguments, by which from old times a materialistic atheism has been discredited, I intend to

suggest to you that you should have these arguments ever on your lips; still less would I advise the clergy to introduce them into ordinary sermons. Beware lest, in a mistaken zeal to resist materialism, you give your opponents occasion to scoff at your injudicious treatment of subjects which are very intricate, and which require much knowledge before we can handle them in detail. If it be true that such pernicious error as we have been speaking of finds its way into our homes, and reaches the rawest and least well-informed of our people through much of the current literature of the day, it is well to proclaim that we are not ashamed to rest our belief in God and a life spiritual and immortal on the intellectual basis of the old arguments by which great heroes of the human race smote down similar sophistical reasonings in the old times. But, practically, little is gained for the good of souls in such cases by argument, except that it is well to have the feeling of security which the knowledge of such arguments in reserve confers. If

we would have those whom we can influence free from this wasting taint, let us teach them practically to live as in the presence of God, to hold intercourse with Him, and love the thought of Him as an ever-present and affectionate Father. Teach them practically to listen to conscience as His voice, and to look forward as solace, in the midst of life's cares and sorrows, to the prospect of being admitted at last into His immediate and felt presence. The true cure for poisonous error is to be found, not in speculations, but in that practical grasp of truth which unites the soul to God and the spiritual world through the daily growing purification and elevation of the life and character. All experience shows also that in no way can this progressive purification and elevation be so effectually secured as by setting forth the adorableness of the Everlasting Father through His reflected image in the Incarnate Son, and through all the wonderful channels in which the human soul has its love for God drawn forth by feeling how the Son of God

in His life and death, meets all its needs. There is nothing illogical in introducing distinctly Christian arguments in refutation of a system which appears so entirely incapable of being influenced by a reverent Christianity that it rejects the basis of all natural religion. Mark the way in which Christ manifested in the Gospels does take possession of the heart, and draw it so powerfully to the Everlasting Father, that, before the brightness of the Sun of Righteousness, the mists which rise from a gross materialistic atheism break up and are scattered like the clouds of night before the dawn.

III.

ITS CONFLICT WITH THE DEIST.

(*Delivered at Dover, on September 7th, to the Rural Deaneries of Dover, Elham, East Bridge, and Sandwich.*)

MY REVEREND BRETHREN, AND MY BRETHREN THE CHURCHWARDENS,—Those of you who have read the addresses I delivered at Croydon and at Tunbridge will know that I propose to myself, during this Visitation, to dwell more on matters which concern the Church generally than on questions peculiar to ourselves. Since I met the diocese at Tunbridge last Friday, however, one matter of very great interest among ourselves has been settled by the Legislature—I

mean the Burials Bill—and I think it well to prefix to this address a few words on that subject. You all know the part I have for several years taken in the controversy which the Burials Bill has raised. I have been anxious that its inevitable settlement should be so arranged as to relieve the clergy, as much as possible, from the hardship against which four thousand of them protested in the time of Archbishop Longley, arising from the obligation, often felt to be intolerable, of burying without distinction all persons not excluded by the strict letter of the Rubrics, though they might be known to have died in the actual commission of scandalous offences. No doubt the danger of a clergyman being exposed to prosecution, on his refusal to use the whole burial service in such cases, had been exaggerated; but still some relief was wanted. We have been fortunate in having this burial question made the subject of legislation under the auspices of a Lord Chancellor of whom no one doubts that he has given the strongest

possible pledges of his devout attachment to the Established Church. And both he, and I am bound to add, from what I personally know for certain, the majority of the House of Commons, have felt that it would be unfair to concede a settlement of the grievance alleged by Nonconformists, without a corresponding concession, so far as the circumstances of the case render it possible, to what was allowed to be the reasonable grievance of the clergy. This, then, has been one of my main endeavours in this controversy—to preserve the substance, even if we were unable to maintain the actual words, of that arrangement by which the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury proposed to meet this grievance of the clergy. In this we have been successful. Moreover, with the concurrence of a large majority in the House of Commons, we have maintained that no services shall be introduced into our churchyards which are not Christian. I cannot believe that there are any among us who do not realize the importance of this distinction. I cannot

think that there is any man, holding the faith of the Church of England, who does not feel that there is an infinite difference between those who profess to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ' and those who repudiate Him. I should be astonished if there were any who really held that, provided a man is a Nonconformist or a Roman Catholic, he might, on account of his separation from our own Church, almost as well be an atheist or a Mohammedan. Therefore I greatly prize the retention of the clause which provides that all services in our churchyards shall be Christian as well as orderly. I am glad, also, that the rights of the clergy are maintained in the general care and superintendence of their churchyards. I am glad also that, if they can state plain reasons for objecting, they may refuse to allow funerals on Sunday, and certain other holy days. Having once made up my mind to concede the liberty of interring Nonconformists, who desired to be buried near the graves of their more orthodox fathers, in places which I was glad to find that they

professed to regard as sacred on account of family or other tender associations, I could not give a conscientious support to the introduction of clauses into this Bill which would, in my judgment, and that of the Government and the majority of the Legislature, have been fatal to its principle. And if in this particular I have differed from several of my brethren on the bench, and from a large body of the clergy, I feel sure that none of you would have wished me to act against my conscientious convictions. It is a satisfaction to me to know that many of the most respected of the clergy, in this diocese and elsewhere, entirely agree with me in the general course I have taken upon this whole subject. On the other hand, I am aware that, not unnaturally, the change which this Act will introduce is very distasteful to many of you. I cannot but think that some of the clergy have exaggerated to themselves the greatness of the contemplated change, and I can understand their dissatisfaction. But I can scarcely doubt that, as a body, they will, on reflection, allow that

a measure directly supported by at least one-half of the episcopal bench as necessary and right under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, and acquiesced in, however unwillingly, by the great majority of the bishops, as inevitable, cannot be so unwise and bad as some excited spirits have represented it. My own hope is that it will serve to strengthen the Church by removing a most painful cause of controversy, uniting with us more closely in death those whom unfortunate circumstances have alienated in their lifetime from the beneficent ministration of the Church of their fathers.

Let me, in leaving this subject, commend to the careful attention of all who have been unduly excited by this controversy, the touching words in which the Bishop of Lincoln closed the debate in the House of Lords last Friday. No one could be more conscientiously opposed to this measure, from first to last, than that man of deep learning and holy life. Let all, therefore, who value his counsels ponder well the weighty words which he addressed to

them on the practical duties which lie before them. I have thought his objections to this measure exaggerated, but I do not fail to acknowledge how formidable an obstacle in the way of the settlement of this question has been presented by his conscientious convictions, and how important, therefore, it is that he has given to those who may be expected to be influenced by his decisions, advice so wise and truly Christian. I would only add to what he has said a few words of advice to those for whose sake chiefly this Bill has been passed into a law. I am aware that violent agitators among them are altogether dissatisfied with it, on account of its Christian character, and the measure of consideration which it has given to the rights and feelings of the clergy. To these men it is useless for me to appeal. I have never doubted that they have further objects behind. Many desire the utter subversion of our Established Church, and are ready, for this object, to unite with the foes of all religion. Such assaults, I need not say, we are determined to with-

stand. But may I not say to the great body of religious Nonconformists in this country, that we look confidently to them, to their good principle, and good faith, and kindly Christian feeling, to falsify the dismal vaticinations which have been uttered in some quarters, and to show that, over the grave at least, they desire that the controversies which keep us asunder should be hushed, and that nothing should be heard in the ground in which we lay our dead, in sure and certain hope of a resurrection, but words of peaceful hope and comfort, which will approve themselves to Him who is the Resurrection and the Life?

And now I leave questions respecting our own Church's privileges, and the differences of opinion among ourselves. Now, as at Tunbridge last Friday, I desire to draw your attention to some phases of that conflict which has certainly begun, both in our own and other lands, between the Church and Faith of Christ on one side, and those who deny His power. I proceed to ask, what will, in all human

probability, be in England the fate or condition of the Church and belief of the future? We are threatened by some, as I have already said, with the overthrow of all Churches, and the substitution for them of a philosophy. The Church must always be greatly affected by the prevailing philosophy, as both the schools of the prophets and the schools of the philosophers profess to have in the main the same object—namely, to lead men to the truth. I stated at Tunbridge my reasons for believing that neither we nor our sons will see the triumph of an atheistical philosophy; but are we so sure that we shall not be handed over to a cold Deism? England had some difficulty in making its escape from such a system in the eighteenth century. Thanks principally to Bishop Butler, and to the other lights which reflected his teaching, though in varying forms; thanks to Paley, to Douglas, and to Watson, all four of them ministers of our English Church, we escaped this evil. Thanks also to Lardner, however doubtful

might be the form of dogmatic Christianity to which he adhered, when Deism was smitten by his great work, and thanks to the returning good sense of the English nation, revolting, towards the end of the century, from the impiety and wild schemes of the great French Revolution, we were saved. Thanks, perhaps, most of all, to that revival of deep religious feeling which Wesley and Whitfield stirred in our Church before they or their followers left it, and to that school distinctly within our own body with which to the end they maintained friendly relations—Fletcher of Madeley and Romaine, and the others who set before their fellow Churchmen the example of a deepened spiritual life. Thanks, also, earlier, to such men as Robert Nelson, who had, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, received and handed down from the seventeenth the teaching of Bishop Andrewes. Thanks, also, to other men little known, who, following the same guidance, gave here and there through the century the same teaching to their fellow

Churchmen. Who that understands the words he uses can charge the theology of Bishop Andrewes with being unspiritual? Thanks, I say, then, to all these lights, some of them shining brightly in conspicuous places, some bearing their torch through the length and breadth of the land, and some burning very feebly, scarce observed in solitary places,—thanks to the united efforts of them all, and to God's overruling providence, the cold system which seemed at one time likely to freeze all vital warmth out of our nation's creed, was thoroughly discredited by sound argument and deep feeling, and our countrymen as a body resolved, that, whatever their form of Christianity might be, they would not be satisfied with becoming mere Deists.

And so it appears we are not to speak of the revival of "Deism" now, for the name has become discredited, and our new philosophers are not "Deists" but "Theists." What the distinction is I leave them to explain. The old giant who frightened, not

without cause, our fathers of the last century was certainly smitten by the Davids of that time with their sling stones, and they were able even to cut off his head as he lay prostrate; and now the successor of the old evil comes out in a new guise and with a new name. Yet I do not know that the system is so new as it would represent itself. Indeed, it is only an old foe revived. We need no new arguments to meet old errors. Till the old tried arguments are refuted, which they never have been, they are enough, and we are right to fall back on them. It is maintained indeed by the Theist that he must not be confounded with the Deist of the last century, for this reason, that he grounds his system not on the mere conclusions of pure intellect, but also on the suggestions of the conscience and the heart, and he contends that he is thus distinguished from most of the old Deists by a far deeper religious sentiment. Still, after full allowance has been made for what is thus urged, the fact remains that

modern Theism, like the old Deism, is a setting up of what used to be called natural religion in the place of revealed. It teaches that all man wants of religious knowledge, all, indeed, that is really true, may be known by the unaided human reason, taking that word in its widest sense, and ought, through reason, to be elicited, as their essence, from the forms in which it has been presented, distorted, and caricatured by the superstitions which have sprung from man's imagination excited by his fears.

Now, it is a long time since Lessing, in *Nathan der Weise*, set forth the picture of a father who had a valuable ring, of which he wished the worthiest of his three sons to be the inheritor; but as the three sons could not all have the precious ring, and he hesitated himself to decide among them, he determined to conceal which was the true original, and had two counterfeits made, slightly different, it might be, but still very like the true. These three rings he bequeathed to his three sons,

the Jew, the Christian, and the Mohammedan, and it was impossible for any of the three to prove that his own was the genuine ring. We may extend Lessing's fable to suit modern views. Perhaps our modern philosophers would enlarge the family circle to whom these jewels were bequeathed, by admitting into it the Buddhist, and the Hindoo, and the red Indian who speaks of a great Spirit and immortal hunting grounds, and even the degraded savage of Africa, or so-called aboriginal tribes of other continents, who have little religion beyond their terror for their Medicine-Man, and perhaps some dim worship of their ancestors, tempered by a dread of evil spirits. Some of these must, of course, be allowed to have as their talisman very degraded copies indeed of the original Divine jewel; but our philosopher requires each of them to bear his part in that natural history of religions, which throws the creed of all into the cauldron, and by the alchemy of an enlightened reason hopes to bring out from their fusion some likeness,

more or less perfect, of that archetype which they all resemble, though in very different degrees.

Now it must not be taken for granted without proof that all the religions of the earth have so much in common that they can thus be classified together. For example, with respect to Buddhism, about which we hear so much nowadays, ought it not, in any sound logical classification, to stand apart by itself? Is it true that the highest aspiration to which it would raise the soul, is that of annihilation, or absorption into the animating principle of the universe? Is it true that there are grave doubts whether it believes in any personal God, and that it represents to its ordinary followers as the legitimate object of worship, not any God, but an almost infinite succession of godlike men? The claim which it makes to our attention is rather due to the supposed purity of its precepts, than to its teachings about the Divine Being. Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism have creeds which

distinctly teach the existence of One Personal God: they can well, therefore, be compared together. Even the old Greek and Roman Paganism, with all its multiplicity of deities, had some vague apprehension of the nature of the one Supreme Being, the basis and originator of all things. The far-off Oriental religions require to be studied more accurately than they seem yet to have been studied before any philosophy can enucleate the teaching of their complicated systems, respecting the belief in the existence of one all-powerful God, and a real life of the human soul after death.

But, after all, it is not our business to follow the steps of our theistical philosophers, through the labyrinth by which they would prove that the rudiments of the system they finally put up for our worship are to be found from an examination of all the religions of the earth. It will be more to our purpose to look carefully to the result of their speculations, rather than to the steps by which they have arrived at it. It is our business to test how far it

meets man's wants, and will hold him up in the day of trouble. A God who hides Himself except so far as He may be known through the efforts of the pure intellect, or in the voices of the longing heart; a life on earth in which He scarcely can be held to interfere, as all things move on irresistibly by the laws He has established; a life of the spirit hereafter, if there be such life, not assured by any direct manifestations from above, but dimly conjectured as a probable expectation—this, I think, is the residuum supposed to represent the sacred substance which all the confused earthly copies have been caricaturing. The question is whether this theism is likely to prevail as the philosophy or religion of the coming age. In order to answer this question it is necessary to consider how far the system will stand the test of a sound logic. Of course, we cannot here run through the lengthened series of those evidences by which revealed religion has been confirmed, in opposition to the Deism of the last century. Not a charge, but a library, would be required

to develop these arguments. Let me very briefly recapitulate a few which I think it will be hard for our antagonist to dispose of.

First, an *à priori* argument. If there is a God, which the theist allows, is it not naturally to be expected that He will make himself felt? If He be a God of love and of truth, can we suppose that, being all-powerful, He will allow His creatures to drift far away from truth and holiness, and to establish among themselves a state of internecine hatred and warfare where there might be love and peace, and allow such a state of things to spread over the whole earth without putting forth one effort to make Himself known? The experience of the history of religions shows that the unaided human reason, and the best natural feelings of the human soul, cannot of themselves master and secure and uphold pure conceptions of the Godhead, and of man's relations to Him. Is it, then, unreasonable to suppose that, in order to prevent such ideas from perishing from the whole earth, the all-powerful God

may naturally be expected from time to time to manifest Himself in some unusual way, that He may make Himself better felt and known, at least to some portion of the human race, which may ultimately be the means of spreading truth and light to all? Granted that there is a God, a revelation, in some form, we cannot say what, may be expected.

Secondly, how do you account for the undoubted fact that certain persons, whose historical existence cannot with any show of reason be denied, such as Moses or Isaiah, have believed that they had some instruction direct from God, other than could be attained by the exercise of their natural faculties, and that, in consequence, they have been able to teach with a power unknown before, and that their belief in this supernatural guidance has, as a matter of fact, greatly influenced the whole history of the civilization of the world? It will not do to answer that Mohammed, and perhaps the Buddhist sage, have claimed some similar enlightenment. The question now

under this particular head of our argument, is not how many people have been thus enlightened from God. The claims of each competitor will have to be tested by the strict scrutiny of what they did and said, and of the enduring and life-giving effects of their teaching. All that is contended for here is that, instead of the probability being against God having spoken through a direct manifestation of Himself to His creatures, the probability is on the other side. It may be granted that this probability does not, by itself, amount to a very strong argument, but, at all events, it predisposes us to look with care to the recorded manifestations of the Deity, and cuts away the ground from under those who would maintain that such manifestations are altogether out of the question.

Thirdly, we are landed in the distinct historical evidence for the truth of Christianity. That Jesus Christ lived, born in the reign of Augustus Cæsar, and put to death under

Tiberius, is as undoubted a fact of history as that Cicero spoke in the Roman senate, or that Augustus or Tiberius reigned. So also it is an undoubted fact of literary history that within some thirty years of Christ's death, certain letters were written by one Paul, a Jew of Tarsus, setting forth what, in consequence of Christ's life and death, His followers believed respecting Him, and His connexion with the Eternal Father and with the spiritual destinies of the human race, and respecting the precepts which He had left for the regulation of His disciples lives. I say nothing now of the detailed narratives of the Evangelists. Can any one read what we know from the barest survey of the origin of the Christian Church, and the history of its first thirty years, culminating in St. Paul's epistles, without allowing that Jesus Christ claimed to be the Son of God, and in that capacity claimed to make known His Father's will as it had never been known before? We must drive our antagonists to the common vulgar dilemma, "Do you hold Him to have been

impostor or wild enthusiast?" Impostor is out of the question; for any one whose mind is not darkened by invincible prejudice must allow that we have stamped upon the history of His times at least the traces and chief lineaments of what He spake, and how He passed His life, and I put it to any candid mind whether it is possible that one who so spake, and so lived, could be a mere impostor. And if you say, "Not, of course, a vulgar impostor, but an enthusiast, dreaming dreams about himself and God, and not hesitating to force those dreams upon mankind by any assistance of the common arts for spreading opinion which were familiar to his day," then let me ask you what you mean by an enthusiast. Is it one who feels God within him, as the derivation of the word implies? The question is no longer whether Jesus Christ believed Himself to have a mission from the Father, but whether He was justified in this belief. I cannot tell you how the Father speaks to the human soul and consciousness, how He makes His presence known, but certainly Christ

believed and taught that His union with the Father, whatever it might be, did open to Him ready access to the Eternal Throne. Dreams, do you call them? They are certainly marvellous dreams, embodying themselves in marvellous discourses, teaching a spiritual religion scarcely guessed at except here and there by ancient sages when they thought themselves wrapped in beatific vision. Can you prove that this enthusiast, as you call Him, was wrong when He felt and taught that God was in Him? And if you cannot prove that He was wrong, and you allow that God may not unnaturally be expected so to manifest Himself, read, I beseech you, carefully and reverently, as becomes the subject, all that we can learn of what the Lord thought, and said, and did. For the present argument I do not care whether you take the record of His work from the four acknowledged Evangelists, or from some of those supposed earlier fragments which an ingenious criticism has delighted of late to set up as the rivals of the Evangelists; they all tell what is practically

the same tale, and it is the tale which St. Paul received and recorded. Do not tell me here of differences which an exaggerated hypercriticism has tried to set forth as existing between the Christianity of St. Peter and St. Paul. The main substance of the Lord's teaching, resting on His Divine claim, is certainly common to both apostles. Study, then, the record of this teaching, and tell me whether man ever spake like this Man; whether these calm reasonings as to moral duty, and that deep spiritual insight into the nature of the human soul and the source from which it derives its life, which breathe through the records, can be the product of the dreams springing from a heated and disordered imagination. If they were dreams and imaginations, God sent them; and, proceeding from Him, they are the expression of eternal truths. How have they spoken to thousands of souls during the ages, and sustained them in life's worst trials and in the hour of death! If they do not come from God, whence do they come? In truth, we know them to be His

words as clearly as if we had heard them spoken from the peak of Sinai.

This, in short, set forth in a few lines, is the conception we would force upon our philosophers, of what is meant by revelation — God unveiling Himself in a marvellous way for the instruction and guidance of His creature, man. A marvellous way—that is, a way not to be accounted for by the common rules according to which ordinarily the natural reason and the natural conscience work. Natural religion, then, has revelation as its supplement. The old Deism was an untenable system, stopping short with natural religion, and the so-called new Theism is no better, unless it makes some strange alliance, which seems to be destructive of its very first principles, with a system of religion based on some distinct revelation from God. I do not think it an unimportant matter that a man should reject atheism, and systems akin to atheism, in favour of a distinct belief in God. It was a great privilege which the old Jews enjoyed, even those

of them who were least able to appreciate the spiritual promises of a coming Messiah, that they believed in one Almighty God, whom they recognised as their Heavenly Father, and to Whom they were able to turn as their support and guide in the emergencies of life. It would be something to be a Mohammedan, with his firm belief in Allah, were it not for the debasing influence of those apparently inseparable surroundings which prevent the monotheism of Islam from rising to spiritual perception of God, and any true spiritual training of the human soul, and which seem to have an inevitable tendency to destroy social life and thwart the progress of any high civilization. It is a privilege which the Parsee enjoys that through the outward emblem of light, he reveres the great First Cause, and in India, for example, keeps himself free from the gross idolatries that surround him. But all these systems, while they acknowledge one great God and Universal Father, and while the gulf, therefore, which separates them from blank atheism is

deep and impassable, still, examined in their entirety, must be pronounced to be very wanting in the highest elements of a Theism which brings the soul near to God, and represents God as ever near to the soul. Judaism may do this far more than the others in its degree; but surely impartial students of the Old and New Testaments must allow nowadays that Judaism points to something beyond itself, and that something is the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Besides, Judaism would not be what it is, soaring above human systems, if it did not point to the revelations it has received.

I argue, then, that a man who really believes in God must go further than what was of old called natural religion. A good Theist, if he is true to his convictions, and does, in very truth, realize them, will keep near to the God he acknowledges by placing himself in the attitude of prayer. He will read reverently, and ponder over instructions which profess to come directly from the Source of knowledge. He will love the true, the pure, and the holy, professing to look up to

One who is absolute truth, purity, and holiness. If he does all this, he is not far from the kingdom of God, and is surely bound by the rules of sound logic, and in accordance with the dictates of his highest reason, and the voices of his best nature, to go forward and become a Christian.

I think, my Christian friends, that you will do well, in the conciliatory spirit of love, to set some such considerations as these before any of your brothers who may be disposed to rest their hopes for time and eternity on a Deism or Theism which takes no account of revelation. My distinct conviction is that such a system cannot stand. It must not be supposed that I am advising all who hear me to plunge into the study of the evidence for a Divine revelation. Such study cannot profitably be entered on without careful preparation. But still, I do wish to note that an acquaintance with the nature of this evidence and some of its principal features is very necessary in these days, when sophistical arguments, adverse to all revelation, are perpetually forced on our attention. It is

well that from time to time, with a view to be ready to defend ourselves and those whom we can influence, as well as to give us confidence against arrogant and unscrupulous attacks, we should, as it were, take stock of the contents of our well-stored armoury. And this also I would have you note, that the reverent and wisely-directed study of such evidence has an elevating and purifying effect. It has two departments—one philosophical, the other historical. I think the man who approaches such subjects in a right spirit will find that the philosophical part of the evidence leads him to dwell with humility and adoring awe on what he learns of God's nature and of his own. And this reverent contemplation of the nature of God and of man must elevate and purify the mind; while the second part of the evidence—the strictly historical—gives us more vivid conceptions of the reality of the recorded facts by which revelation is avouched, introduces us into greater familiarity with the persons and characters whose teaching we study, and, above all, enables us more

thoroughly to appreciate that Divine historical picture of God manifest in the flesh—Christ living and dying for His people—around which all sound evidence for revelation revolves. I am not one of those who distrust the study of the evidences for revelation as if they suggested more doubts than they solve. Entered on with suitable preparation, and reverently conducted, such study tends, I doubt not, to raise the whole character, by bringing the intelligence as well as the devotional feelings, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, more directly into communication with the true God, manifested in Jesus Christ.

IV.

ITS CONFLICT WITH THE RATIONALIST.

(*Delivered at Ashford, on September* 10*th, to the Rural Deaneries of North and South Lympne and East and West Charing.*)

My Reverend Brethren and my Brethren the Churchwardens,—The subject with which I propose to deal in my visitation address to-day differs from the principal subject in each of my last two addresses in this respect—at Tunbridge and at Dover I spoke of the necessity of our being prepared at this time to meet, by the approved old arguments, what I believe to be after all, notwithstanding their claims to novelty, two very old forms of error lately revived among us. The system of which I would chiefly speak to-day has more appearance of being new.

Many are greatly alarmed by the existence in our Church of doctrines and errors more or less approximating to what our fathers regarded as the exploded superstitions of Rome; and no doubt there is an attractiveness to many minds in mediæval forms of doctrine and of worship. It ought to be the part of those who guide the thought of the Church in this age to teach men how to prize and use aright the freedom vindicated for them at the Reformation, and so to imbue their minds with love of Apostolic Christianity, that they may easily cast off the infection of that spurious and distempered system which in dark times tainted and corrupted its simplicity. As I have said before, I am in no way insensible to dangers of this kind, and I trust they will be met by sound Church of England teaching, maintaining the doctrines of the pure Gospel, as taught in primitive times. But, great as this danger may be, it is not to blind us to others of a totally different kind, to which I wish principally to direct attention to-day. Indeed, in my judgment almost the gravest danger

from the strange revival, here and there, of superstition in this nineteenth century arises from the reaction which it is certain to produce. The current of popular opinion throughout the world is all in the opposite direction from superstition ; and I have great fear lest, in the long run, the faith of our Church and country may suffer far more by abstraction from than by addition to its approved system of Christian doctrine. It is curious to observe how, within the last few years, there have been signs that some of those who would reduce Christian doctrine to very meagre limits, do not hesitate to avail themselves of the popular taste for outward ceremonial, and make in appearance a strange alliance with the system to which in truth they are most distinctly opposed.

There is, I hold, real ground to fear lest the tendencies of this age result in the prevalence of a lax view of Christian doctrine and teaching, in many respects unlike anything with which our country has in former times been familiar. Presenting itself under the guise of an improved

and more rational Christianity, speaking with the greatest respect of the Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles; professing to regard them as great benefactors of the human race, and even admitting that the historical Christ is in some sense a wonderful manifestation of God brought near to man, it virtually substitutes a new in the place of the old genuine Gospel. The old Unitarianism had something in it akin to this system, and some modern Unitarians seem to have adopted it. We do not deny that its promoters have high aims, a zeal for the pure morality of the Gospel, and many lofty aspirations after holiness and intercourse with God. But, convinced as I am that there is something very hollow in it, I cannot look on without great alarm, if it be true that attempts are made to present our children and young people with this substitute for the real Gospel. Should it prevail, I fear we must bid farewell to a true conception of human nature and the hatefulness of sin, and lose the most powerful motives which can guide human life, and be content to sink

to views of Christian duty and the elevation of the Christian character very different from those which animated the Apostles.

I have endeavoured to set forth, in my former addresses, my grounds for the expectation that our countrymen will not, in the coming age, give themselves up either to an atheistical or to a simply Deistical philosophy. Are we equally secured against a meagre sublimated Christianity, such as St. Paul certainly would not have recognised as the Gospel which saved his soul, and to which he devoted his life? I say St. Paul, because, I take it, our neo-Platonists, or by whatever name they are to be designated, will grant to us that St. Paul's Christianity and theirs is very different. I do not suppose that they are any better satisfied with that form of the original Gospel which, as we have seen before, certain ingenious critics, more or less connected with their school, are fond of attributing to St. Peter, whom they would represent as the antagonist of St. Paul. I have alluded before to some sure grounds for the conviction

that there never was in existence any earlier form of Christianity of a so-called more philosophic cast, of which St. Paul's and St. Peter's teaching was an exaggerated caricature. In spite of all the cavilling of what calls itself the advanced criticism, there remain sure historical grounds for the assumption that there never was any earlier form of Christianity than that to which these Apostles devoted their lives. A Christianity with the supernatural element eliminated from it would have appeared to them, as it justly appears to us, to be no Christianity at all.

Our great apologists of the last century rightly and wisely turned to the Resurrection of Christ, as the central point to which the whole conflict with infidelity must be directed. They agreed with St. Paul: "If Christ be not risen, then is your faith vain; ye are yet in your sins." I remember being visited in my rooms at Oxford, now some forty years ago, by a young German, a disciple of this new Christianity. I have seen the incident recorded

in some periodical of late years; but it was to myself that it happened. The young man seemed to me in his rash statements to be very ignorant of the Bible. I made him read the 15th Chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, which appeared to be somewhat new to him. He read it attentively, and, when he had finished it, he said, "He was a good man Paulus, but he had his fancies, and this was one of them." This, in fact, is the key of the position. Is St. Paul's account of the Resurrection a mere fancy, or is it based on a real historical fact? That he himself held it to be historical and real there can be no doubt. The way in which he treats the subject —the whole narrative which he gives of the Lord's appearance after His death — the witnesses still living to whom he appeals— leave no doubt of what he thought of the Resurrection. And if he adds, "Last of all He was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time," do these words, describing his own ecstatic vision, lessen the force of what he tells

us of the appearances vouchsafed to others, whether they were or were not in many respects dissimilar in kind from the vision which he saw apparently not once only, but many times throughout his life? Would there be anything unnatural in St. John, on the sea-shore at Patmos, welcoming the wonderful vision and the heavenly voice vouchsafed to him in his ecstasy, as a fresh assurance to his soul that the Friend, whom he had known living upon earth, whom he had seen die, and whom afterwards he had seen living, was indeed alive for evermore? So St. Paul, in like manner, deploring that he had been so long a stranger to the Gospel of Christ, and had not been associated with the disciples during those forty days when the risen Lord mysteriously lingered near them on this earth after His death and resurrection, naturally breaks out—"Though I had not this privilege, and was as one born out of due time, yet I too in my degree—and according to the laws which regulate the existence of the Eternal

Son, now that He has gone back to the presence of the Father—I, too, have seen my Lord, and am strengthened by an assurance that He is still living and is at hand to help me." What was the exact nature of those manifestations by which Christ, during the forty days, from the first Easter to the first Ascension Day, assured His disciples that death had no power over His combined spiritual and fleshly nature, it is impossible to say. We have in our hands an account of the events which has every claim to be deemed historical. We are not entitled to make more of the recorded events, or less, than the text warrants. On this, however, we are justified in saying the Gospel of Christ is built; that He who lived and taught among His disciples, having ended His earthly course by death, proved incontestably to them after He had died that death had no more dominion over Him. His nature, like ours, consisted of compound elements, which we designate as soul and body: of these compacted there was one Man, and in some mysterious and

supernatural way, which approved itself to their senses and their reason, He manifested to His disciples that the whole man, Jesus Christ, in His compound nature, was living after death. Till He did so, they mournfully thought they were disappointed by His death in their hopes that it was He who should have restored and built up the Israel of God. From the assurances He gave them by His appearances they gained a new strength. If Christ had died, and there was an end of Him, His precepts might indeed live as those of any other Rabbi or of any one of the old Prophets, but the hopes that were to sustain His Church in its conflict with a persecuting world, even unto death—where were they? Buried in the grave with Him. Where was the assurance of the truth of all He had taught them—"I am the Resurrection and the Life" "He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die"? Is it not the echo of these words that we find pervading

the whole system of the Gospel as it went forth in the first age to draw the world after it? What else sustained its despised followers when persecution raged, first through Jewish hatred, and afterwards through the arbitrary decrees of Roman law, alarmed at the sight of the deserted temples? Jesus lives, and has been proved to be alive. He is at the Father's right hand making intercession for us, as Stephen saw the Lord when in the hour of supreme agony he commended to Him his departing spirit. And the death of Christ, did it not become itself a source of life to perishing souls, through the assurance given by the Resurrection that the life laid down for man was surrendered voluntarily by One Who, in His own nature, had power over death and hell? And is it not a conviction of these truths, all based on Christ's rising from the dead, that through the ages has made the Gospel of Christ what it is to us—the consoler of the sorrowful, the healer of the conscience-stricken, the antidote against the fear of death?

The Gospel, therefore, with the supernatural element eliminated, has ceased to be the Gospel; it may be a philosophy with more or less of claim to a preference over other human systems; but it is not that which the Apostles received from the Lord and handed down from Him to be the guide of all nations.

It will be understood that it is impossible in this short compass to embody more than a very slight sketch of the arguments which I believe exclude the idea of a Christianity without the Resurrection. The more you examine the matter, the more, I believe, will you be convinced that this great Christian truth is the keystone on which the Gospel rests; and certainly if there be no Gospel without the Resurrection, there is none without the supernatural. The Resurrection once granted, it becomes a question merely of more or less, how far or with what qualifications every detail of each recorded influence of the supernatural is to form an integral part of the Christian Creed. With the general

arguments establishing the inspiration of the sacred records, we have at present nothing logically to do. And certainly, apart from such general arguments for inspiration, no one who understands the subject will contend that each separate miracle, taken by itself, rests on the same historical evidence as the one great central fact of the Resurrection. After the questions connected with the inspiration of the sacred writers have been fully discussed, the degree of certainty as to each detail obtained from its incorporation in the historical narrative may be rightly estimated; but at present, and, indeed, in all treatises on evidences, properly so called, the books containing the facts of sacred history must be regarded in the first instance not as proved to be inspired, but as ordinary historical documents. This they certainly are, independently of the higher character which can afterwards be vindicated for them.

Now let us stop to consider how the general argument as to the Gospel miracles stands,

when we view it apart from any theory of inspiration. The detailed narratives of the Lord's life contain the account of a great many miracles. It is important to observe, as we have done above, that the Epistles, as well as the Gospels, make Christianity to rest on a supernatural, otherwise called a miraculous, basis. There is, therefore, an *à priori* probability that the life as well as the death of the Lord Jesus was attended by supernatural manifestations. Indeed, if He was what the Resurrection, with its sequel, proves Him to have been, He could not have come into this world and moved as He did among men without an effort of supernatural and miraculous power. The ordinary course and laws of nature, as manifested in the common history of man, were not capable of producing such a one as Jesus of Nazareth was proved by His Resurection to be. Therefore, before the mysterious narrative of His Incarnation we bow in awestruck silence. How could the Son of God come into the world? No mere human experience can tell you. We know

what was believed by His disciples in the earliest age, when they had learnt to recognise how superhuman was His nature. No other account of the mystery has ever found credit in the Church ; and if you believe in Christ's Resurrection, I see not how you can logically hesitate at the mystery of His Incarnation. Also, being such a One as His Resurrection proved Him, He must surely, through all His early life, have had around him a halo of the supernatural. When, therefore, the narratives of the Evangelists are placed in your hands as corroborating in detail the more general statements of St. Paul, you have no cause to be surprised when you find them such as they are, and you read and ponder on their minutest details with a reverence which you agree with the Church Universal in believing to be their due.

The prejudice against miracles which is characteristic of the present age is unreasonable, and has been imported into the sort of Christianity of which we have been speaking, from Hume and from the Deists of the last

century. We are not to surrender our reason in judging the evidence for the miraculous; but it is equally unreasonable to pronounce, with not a few sceptics of the present day, who have recurred to the language of Hume, that all miracles are in themselves impossible, or, at least, incapable of proof. To say this is to beg the question. The very question before us is whether some miracles have not been proved, to the satisfaction of sound reason, by historical evidence that cannot be confuted, and it will never do to keep harping on the general premise that they are impossible, in answer to our tangible and manifest good proofs that they have happened. Moreover, I would have our antagonists consider that their prejudice against the introduction of the miraculous into the scheme of the true religion is not only unreasonable, but shows a great ignorance of human nature. Do some of them in their philosophical exultation stumble at all narratives of the miraculous and think that they could believe a religion far better which had no

miracles? I must remind them first of all that there are grave doubts whether there can by possibility be any such religion. All religion allows that there is a God. If the existence of God be granted—the existence, that is, of a great first cause antecedent to the establishment of the laws of ordinary nature—creation follows, the greatest of all miracles. Again, all religion has to do with an unseen God, and His unseen but felt influence on the destinies of man. We know nothing of Him, apart from a recognition of something which is supernatural. And so strongly has this true idea of what religion is fixed itself on the human mind, that I am bold to say that through the nineteen centuries since Christ was born, and long before, this very supernatural element, which is a stumblingblock to many of our philosophers in these later days, has been an attraction to thousands upon thousands of simple souls for whom the Gospel has been the Gospel of Life in so many countries and in so many varying stages of civilisation. Is it inconceivable to these enlightened

philosophers that God Almighty, who desired to bring His supernatural truth home to the hearts of these perishing thousands of the human race, may have taken care from the very first, out of His fatherly goodness, that this supernatural religion which He desired to teach them should be borne along in the true history of its Founder with a flood of such supernatural incidents as were likely to arrest their attention, to win their sympathy, and cling to their hearts? The truly wise man will know what helps these miracles have been to many thousands; he will not measure others by his own supercilious objections to them, and he will study the records which contain them with a deep consciousness that he is in the presence and is tracing the ways of One Who is above ordinary nature.

I am aware that some of our antagonists try to draw a line between the supernatural and the miraculous, but the manifestation of the supernatural is a miracle; and what I have been contending for is this—that the whole of Christianity is built upon a manifestion of the

supernatural. We need not enter here on Bishop Butler's suggestion that what we call miracles may be not any stopping of the laws of nature, but the manifestation of some higher order of nature, which has its own higher laws, capable of intervening at the times and under the circumstances which God has fixed for their appearance. I must refer the candid student to Bishop Butler's treatment of this subject.

But then, after all, it is asserted that apologists are too apt to waste their time on the question of whether miracles are possible or not, instead of producing instances in which they are proved by conclusive evidence to have taken place. I answer that if we are guilty of this fault our antagonists have themselves to thank for it, since, as I have said above, from Hume downwards, it is certain that they rest their arguments on an asserted or implied premise—that miracles are impossible, or, at least, inadmissible. What we have said of the evidences for the Resurrection of Christ ought to save our present argument from this objection.

Prejudiced persons may maintain that the evidence as adduced by St. Paul and the Evangelists would not hold good in a court of justice if it were brought forward in a trial on which a man's life depended. I deny this. But let me remind you, also, that what we are maintaining is not what might or might not be thought sufficient evidence in a court of justice, but what is sufficient evidence to establish the truth of a fact in history. I will not allow you to say an improbable fact, for on the hypotheses as to God and man's nature, which in this branch of our discussion both we and our antagonists acknowledge, the thing contended for is proved not to be improbable. We are bound to approach the examination of it in the same impartial frame of mind in which we should test any other alleged facts, and I am confident that the historical verdict must be on our side.

But here let us be done with the dry arguments which, however they satisfy the intellect scarcely reach the heart. Does any earnest-

minded searcher after truth declare that he prefers to dwell rather on the moral than on the strictly logical evidences for his faith? Let him receive every encouragement to do so. Such moral evidences afford a more wholesome food for the soul to feed on. Christ manifested as the God-man, the perfection of humanity, raising from the contempt to which ancient systems had reduced them the lowly virtues which we esteem as the highest Christian graces —the contemplation of this model must raise the soul to those heights above human nature, from which the God-man came, and to which He has ascended. Or shall we contemplate the totally changed view of man's life and destiny into which the advent of the Son of God has introduced us? How different a thing is the end of life now from what it was before Christ's rising. How many thousand saints have felt this difference as they approached to death and passed through it. And life as well as death —how has it been changed. What a dignity has the human body and the human mind

attained from what the Gospel teaches us of its union through Christ with the divine. And our thoughts of God: how much nearer is the Almighty Father brought to His creatures through His manifestation in the Son. The Fatherhood of God: how much better is it comprehended. How is He shown to love every separate human soul, and with what dignity are such souls invested as loved by Him. God is no longer a God at a distance, nor the God only of a privileged race. He has manifested Himself as inviting the poorest slave under the most oppressive thraldom, the outcast, barbarian, or savage, to draw near to Him and to open the heart in His presence. Does a man feel his whole being elevated while he meditates on such evidences as these, attesting the supernatural and divine origin of Christianity? And while he dwells on what Christ was during His earthy sojourn, does it please him to uplift his soul to the Eternal Son now living in the highest heaven, and feeling and caring for the humblest of

mankind? And so employed, does the man declare that he is better occupied than by poring over dry argumentative proofs of the value of the historical record setting forth the steps by which the Divine Saviour mounted to His Kingdom, and showed His people whence He came and whither He was going? No sensible person would desire to divert his friend's mind from such elevating contemplations. It is not with the positive, but the negative part of the modern so-called philosophic theory of Christianity that we find fault. We rejoice at what the man believes of Christ and of His power to heal the wounds of the human soul, and of a life secured for the faithful with Christ hereafter. We desire indeed to add a fuller dogmatic teaching of all the Christian verities, to what his system of philosophy has already grasped, but, rejoicing in the thought of that "whereunto he has already attained," our chief effort will be to urge him to live according to his faith, and we trust that such living will enable him in time to agree more entirely

with the teaching of the Church and of the Bible.

There is a lesson impressed on us by his case, and we shall do well to carry it into every religious controversy which is forced upon us. We differ seriously from our antagonists, but the first thing to ascertain in the controversy is, What are the points on which we agree? Most earnest-minded men are, in truth, very much better than a cold logical statement of their abstract beliefs would represent them. Are they one with us on any points on which they can make with us common cause? Do they agree with us, for example, on the immutable distinctions between right and wrong? Do they assent to the doctrine that we have the means of knowing the one from the other, and are bound to seek the good, though they differ from us as to the source from which conscience springs, and the test by which it arrives at its decisions? So far so good, and we may hope on these foundations of a right belief to lead even the Atheist onwards and

upwards. But, further, do they agree with us that there is a great God in Heaven, Who must be able, if He wills, to read our inmost thoughts? Let us urge on the Theist to realise continually the full force of this doctrine which he recognises, its bearing on an all-pervading Providence, its suggestion that if God is, it may be possible for the soul to hold communion with Him. And if we are right, in the charity which hopeth all things, to act on the principle thus laid down, in dealing with these two sets of bold deniers of the truth of Christianity, how much more must it be our duty not harshly to repel any who claim for themselves the Christian name, and have a Christian faith, however defective? Nothing will be lost, but much gained, by our assuming the attitude of a tolerant and loving desire, while we gladly welcome the truth which they have received, to lead them on to further truth. Such an attitude is most like that of our Heavenly Master, Who sought to cherish the good in every man, and by cherish-

ing it to foster it into a brighter and truer light. Yet with all this toleration and kindly consideration for the opinions of others, we are not to forget the sound arguments, to which, in this address, I have endeavoured to point, whereby I believe it to be shown that this so-called philosophical Christianity will be found wanting when weighed in the balance, and must, as sound reason and goodness prevail, vanish away before the full and true Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Brethren, excuse me if, in the conviction of imminent dangers besetting the purity of our faith, I have dwelt more than was, perhaps, naturally to be expected in a diocesan charge, on matters concerning, not ourselves only, but the whole Church of Christ. We shall make very little progress in the distinctively Church of England work of our separate parishes, if there be any real danger lest the whole Church and faith of Christ throughout the world be unable to maintain itself in the conflict with which these latter days have brought us face

to face. I therefore commend to the thoughtful consideration of all the nature of the conflict in which the whole Church seems to me to be involved, desiring that all of us, one by one, may turn to the Source of Life; that, resting on the truth of the historical narratives respecting Christ and His Apostles, we may be strengthened in our several spheres to advance better in our separate work for God.

V.

ITS DOGMATIC TEACHING.

(*Delivered at Canterbury, on September 22nd, to the Rural Deaneries of Canterbury, Ospringe, Westbere, West Bridge, and Sittingbourne.*)

MY REVEREND BRETHREN, AND MY BRETHREN THE CHURCHWARDENS,—In the earlier addresses delivered at this visitation I have spoken of modern speculations antagonistic to the pure Gospel of Christ, which are, in many cases, but the revival of old exploded errors. Let me not be understood as in any way deprecating a just freedom of thought, or the full development of scientific research. No reasonable Christian will fail to be grateful for the

remarkable progress made of late years in accurate observation of the phenomena of nature, and the classification of the laws through which the Creator works. We hail with real gratitude the unfolding of the history of the changes through which creation has passed, so far as its sequence has been established by researches which rest on a real scientific basis. We are grateful, also, for the wonderful accessions made of late years to our knowledge of the early history of the races of man, of the memorials of their feeble efforts after civilization, of the great progress they attained in the establishment of ancient dynasties, under the shadow of which arts flourished, and a powerful, though it might be a barbaric, culture reigned. We are thankful for all real additions to the sum of human knowledge, though we object to the attempt occasionally made in these restless days to palm off upon us mere imaginative conjectures as the conclusions of science. We are glad that the affinities of the various languages, and the relations of the several races of man,

are better understood than they were a hundred years ago; and we give full weight to all that has been established by such discoveries. Our soundest divines, no doubt, fully admit that many questions connected with the form in which theology is taught may, in consequence of what we now know as to language, ancient monuments, and the earth's changes, require reconsideration and readjustment, while we hold fast the substance of our theological teaching. I shall never forget how some fifty years ago I casually entered the lecture-room in which Chalmers was addressing his students on difficulties supposed to arise from the geological speculations as to the days of creation, which had then just begun to attract more than usual attention. That great master, an ardent disciple of science, as well as a divine, warned his hearers not to be moved by any unworthy fears, as though science and religion could be antagonistic the one to the other. He pointed out how the geological speculations to which he alluded raised a contest only about outworks, while the central fortress

remained impregnable within. And, I suppose, there are few intelligent students of theology nowadays, who see any inconsistency between the teaching of approved geological sciences and the great central truths respecting God and man's nature, communicated to us in the Mosaic records. No doubt a view of these records, somewhat different from that to which we were accustomed in old days, is implied in this change of thought; but neither in respect of the early books of Scripture, nor indeed of any portion of what the Church has received and handed down as the Word of God, is there any change in the reverence attaching to that teaching by which the Holy Spirit of God intended these books to guide the soul. With science generally, and with that scientific, philological, and historical criticism, which, for the last hundred years, in this country and in Germany, has been sifting the sacred books with the minuteness of a microscopical examination, we have no fault to find, where the researches of students have been conducted in the reverent and humble spirit of

true philosophy. And we feel that our faith in the great central Christian verities has come forth unharmed from the scrutiny to which they have been subjected. Nay, that they shine with a brighter light, proved, after having been tried, to be reflections from the very Source of light.

It is time now that I should proceed to lay before you, somewhat in detail, what I trust will stand in the coming age as it stands now, when the philosophies, which somewhat ostentatiously claim to supersede it, shall have been seen in their true dimensions. Undoubtedly, then, the guide of the coming age will be a Church—the Church of Christ in our land—and not simply a philosophy—a Church with a philosophy of its own, a divine philosophy, the mistress and queen, as it was of old held to be, of all the sciences, a science which treats of God in His relations to man, and of man in his relations to God and to his fellow-men, which embraces the whole circle of man's moral being in this life, and which avails itself unreservedly of all the helps which God has given it for raising human hopes and fears

to the contemplation of a life beyond. But is this Church of the future, of which we speak, to be a new Church? This cannot be, if, as we believe, the Church is as old as the Gospel. Let us see. This Church, as its name implies, must be an organized body of believers in its truths, worshipping one God through one Saviour in one appointed way. It has its divinely-ordained Sacraments for initiation into its membership, and for the continuation and increase of the spiritual blessings which it prizes and seeks to disseminate. Such a body will always be more or less obnoxious to all who think they can safely control the world on other principles than those which it upholds. Let us briefly sketch some of the characteristics by which this Church of the future will be distinguished.

First, it will hold fast the faith set forth in the Bible, and will never be weary of turning to the Bible as the basis on which its whole system is built, and by which whatever it teaches must be tested. It will not plunge into vain discussions as to the precise mode and limits of the

inspiration of the writers of the Sacred Books. It will, I think, follow the wise caution of the Thirty-Nine Articles. They give to the Bible the name of "Holy Scripture" and "God's Word written," and assert that "it containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." Moreover, they declare that "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, or besides the same .... to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." They declare that the most authoritative general councils must show their decrees as to what is necessary to salvation to be taken out of Holy Scripture. Yet these articles carefully abstain from any minute distinctions as to what inspiration is—how far it may be verbal or has only to do with the general sense and fully-explained teaching of the sacred writers. They throw no discourage-

ment in the way of the most rigid criticism of the Sacred Books; they set forth, indeed, that these Books must ever maintain their place as tests of truth; but, as their meaning must be arrived at by the reverent use of an enlightened reason, they do not put up the Bible as the antagonist, but as the guiding help of man's reason. How far questions of physical science, or other matters quite irrelevant to the principles by which the human soul lives, have any place in the revelation which the Bible contains, the Articles do not consider. They remind Christians that these sacred Books are in their hands; that the Church has guarded them carefully as its most sacred deposit through the centuries; and that they have not had their high place assigned to them without a very careful examination of their claim to be retained; while, on the other hand, many apocryphal books have been excluded from the canon. With respect to the Old Testament, they tell us to study it as the faithful Jews of old studied it—not

looking in its pages for mere transitory promises, but regarding it as the gradual dawning of the light which was to burn with its full brightness when Messiah came. This sacred character of the Old Testament stands out above all criticism of its details. We are to read all the sacred records as intelligent men, with a full right to judge of their meaning by all helps which an enlightened reason, and an enlarged observation and experience, and the judgment of the wise and good of past and present times may place within our reach. But over all these records there rise the sacred lessons they contain, intelligible to the least-instructed human soul, speaking of God's love and of His hatred of sin, and of the promises which He keeps in store for those who are faithful to Him.

Secondly, does this exaltation of Holy Scripture as the guide supersede all claims of authority? Certainly not. Authority is of two kinds. Every Church must have absolute authority to lay down its form of discipline.

It will act wisely, and in accordance with the precepts of its Master, if it directs its attention as little as possible to the mere formal, as opposed to the more spiritual, part of our religion. But forms it must have for expressing its worship and its belief in the cardinal points of the Christian faith. If these forms were entirely given up there would be no outward cohesion, and, upon the whole, experience teaches that outward cohesion is very useful, if not absolutely necessary, to keep men one in action and in heart. But besides this absolute authority, no Church, as no philosophy, can dispense with that argument from authority which, as I have hinted before, the decisions of the wise and good have ever been held to claim with right in the domain of moral and of spiritual truth. The merest human philosophy, of course, acknowledges such a claim of authority even in that lower range of subjects of which it treats ; still more the Divine philosophy in its higher regions. The Church, then, will never hesitate to give full weight to the

opinions of the wise and good, helped, as it believes them to be, in their conclusions by the Spirit of God. It will not bow to them with any servile or pretended acceptance of their infallibility, but it will listen to them reverently and give them their full weight. Seeking ourselves to be guided in our study of Scripture by the Good Spirit of God, we shall gladly acknowledge the due authority of the opinions of all who have been led by the same Spirit.

Thirdly, the Church, if true to its sacred mission, will ever be on its guard against any lowering of its standard as to what is sin. Here, I fear, is a dangerous tendency of the age we live in—to regard sin rather as a misfortune or a mistake than a fault and corruption. No one can object to the generous impulse which leads us to make due allowance for those who grow up, through no fault of their own, under unfavourable influences; and a merciful God, no doubt, considers and makes due allowance for the inevitable disadvantages under which so many human souls are reared.

But still, sin is sin, and right is right, and the true Church of God never falters in its condemnation of the one, and its upholding of the other. It is its special business to form and maintain an elevated public opinion, based on the standard of the Word of God. And if the Church must thus maintain the exceeding sinfulness of sin, it will never swerve from pointing to the only true remedy. Captious discussions may be raised as to the exact meaning and logical definition of the Atonement, and the Church in all ages has contained within its bosom men who have not thought exactly alike on this matter. But that the death of Christ upon the cross brought God and man together, that His blood washes away the stain of sin—in what mysterious way we know not—that the soul which feels itself by nature estranged from God—and which in all pagan and mere human systems is vainly striving to approach Him, and is often found striving to approach Him through some strange rites of immolation—finds in the doctrine of this one great Sacrifice

a peace and a sense of nearness to the Everlasting Father which it sought hopelessly elsewhere—this doctrine the Church will never part with while the world contains sinners who have souls to be saved.

Fourthly, a true estimate of human nature will ever point to some strange failure from a high original, as set forth in the doctrine of the Fall. No account of the degenerating tendencies of bad example will be sufficient to explain this. There is something radically wrong, and that in a being who bears upon him plain marks of having been destined to achieve a high ideal. The doctrine of original sin will approve itself to the most careful examination of human nature as it is. We shall find it impossible to account otherwise for man's tendency to a rapid degeneracy under unfavourable circumstances, and for the perhaps still more alarming fact that, even under the most favourable circumstances, evil desires and propensities are for ever cropping up in the mind even of the most self-restrained. And this

doctrine of man's inherent weakness will ever point to the necessity of a prevenient and sustaining grace which, through the Holy Spirit's working, is mercifully sent to help and guide those who would otherwise be wandering.

Fifthly. To the doctrines, then, of the Fatherhood of God, and of the loving sympathy of the Eternal Son, shown in His death as a sacrifice, and in His intercession and present aid as our Mediator, the Church necessarily adds the doctrine of the aid of the Holy Ghost. And when it reverently sets side by side all that the Bible teaches on these three great subjects, and weighs them in its speculations on the nature of the Eternal, it acquiesces in those expressions of the ineffable mystery of the nature of the Godhead which have come down to us in the old creeds, asserting the Godhead, the personality, and yet the mysterious union, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Sixthly, as to the outward forms by which this Church of Christ will maintain the

doctrines it upholds. Some of these forms are Divine, and, therefore, necessarily of universal obligation. Some have a lower origin and stringency. "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." If Christ spake these words, baptism is a Divine appointment, and man cannot dispense with it. So also is the Lord's Supper. "Take, eat. This is My body which is broken for you, this do in remembrance of Me." "This cup is the New Testament in My blood, this do ye as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me." "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." The Church of Christ, then, without the Sacraments, would be setting itself up against the Word of Christ. But what a weariness to the devout soul are

the tomes which have been written on the nice questions as to how through these sacraments the Grace of God acts. O, friends, it is a simple faith in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and a simple joyful appreciation of the means ordained in Holy Scripture, whereby the Almighty Godhead helps and elevates our souls, that is of real value in the sight of Christ. And I do hope some here present may live to see a time when this simplicity may be more prized, and the Church may be less vexed by anxious and profitless questionings. The Church of England is very simple, though not undogmatic, in its statements on these matters. Therefore, it is very wide in its comprehension of various private views as to the doctrine of the Sacraments, and in this peculiarity it keeps near to Holy Scripture.

The clergy, indeed, are not entitled, in their arrangements as to our common public worship, to obtrude their private opinions respecting such doctrines on the congregations whose devotions they are appointed to lead. Every

Church must prescribe a liturgy or order for its administration of the Sacraments, and insist that within certain limits a uniformity in this liturgy be observed, so that it neither be added to nor detracted from, and it is the duty of the Bishops, as the executive of the Church, to see that these limits be not transgressed to the reasonable annoyance and scandal of any of those who join with the clergy in public worship. The rulers of the Church, then, are bound to see that nothing is introduced into its ritual which may reasonably be supposed to proclaim disloyalty to the general principles of its teaching. And if the clergy be allowed more freely to assert their own private opinions through their teaching in the pulpit, than through the symbols of public worship, there is no inconsistency here, provided care be taken to prevent any man from contradicting any statement of the formularies; for it is of the very essence of addresses from the pulpit that they profess to be appeals to the reason and the conscience, and that no hearer in an

intelligent age is bound to accept without questioning the statements thus propounded; whereas, in the common worship every man must take a part, and it is unfair, beyond the Church's warrant, to make him join in acts which he believes his Church has not sanctioned.

But no one will deny that besides the Sacraments there must be other outward forms which the Church of Christ must maintain. "Go ye and preach the Gospel." Here is the Divine warrant for the ordinance of preaching. No Church neglects it without inflicting grievous loss. A philosophy which never proclaimed its doctrines would dwindle and decay. A Church whose ministers are dumb dogs is unlike the Church of the Apostles. The preaching and the continual reverent reading of Holy Scripture for edification has, ever since the Reformation, been a marked characteristic of the Church of England. And if, in past times, we did not sufficiently avail ourselves of the invitation to speak to one another and to God

in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, this want has been distinctly felt and recognized, and great efforts have been already made and are making to supply the need. The chief of all Christian ordinances is prayer to the Father through the Son, under the controlling influence of the Holy Spirit. Prayer, and praise, and preaching, and the reading of Holy Scripture are ordinances directly prescribed by God. Other ordinances are the Church's time-honoured forms for common prayer, for edification, and for discipline or regiment. The Church will hold fast by these, both because they are old—some of them Apostolic,—and because they are good. Under this head will fall its confirmations, its formal declarations of God's readiness to absolve, its three-fold scheme of government by bishops, priests, and deacons. We shall not think lightly of what connects us, in outward form, and in spiritual influence, with the times when the Church emerged fresh from the hands of the first followers of the Lord Jesus. We shall, indeed,

be careful, as our article directs, to note that these time-honoured forms, however instinct with spiritual life, are not of the nature of the Sacraments ; but we shall rejoice through them as through the Sacraments, to connect ourselves with the good and holy servants of Christ who have maintained the light of His Gospel even in the darkest ages.

But, some one may say, This Church which you are setting before us for the new age, with its doctrines of the Blessed Trinity, of the corruption of human nature, and the consequent impossibility of man being justified, except through the merits and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, maintaining the old Sacraments and the old ordinances and forms, is nothing else than the old Church of England. It makes, in these respects, common cause with the old superstitious Church of Rome and the old churches of the East, and also with some, at least, of the narrow systems which have shackled the freedom of Christ's teaching, by the chains

of a too rigid logic welded remorselessly by sectarian zeal. True, that this Church is, after all, nothing more or less than the old Church of England, freed from certain modern accretions on the one side and on the other, which had grown round its authoritative creed in times of deadness or unnatural activity. Modern philosophers thought indeed that they had made some rents in the received system. These have been filled up and repaired. I grant that this, which I have here presented, is the old Church of Parker and Hooker, perhaps here and there having lost some few of the peculiar, unimportant features which attached to it from the character and peculiar circumstances of the age in which these divines lived, from the temporary controversies which raged around them, or the temporary discouragement or patronage which alarmed or upheld them. I do not mean that these men foresaw the difficulties which would be suggested after their time by modern thought; but is it not remarkable that those who wrote

our formularies, being, after all, but human compilers, were guided not to embody in them statements which the advancement of knowledge would refute? This arose, I think, from their wisely determining, under God's good guidance, and in imitation of the wisdom of the early creeds, to confine themselves as much as possible, in their expositions of the terms of communion, to the great central, immutable, Divinely communicated truths, passing in silence, as much as the exigencies of their age allowed, through the dangerous field of shifting human opinion. This, then, I maintain, is the same reformed old Church of England —Catholic in its connection with antiquity and with the Universal Church, Protestant in its opposition to the peculiar encroachments of the Roman See. We think none the worse of it because it is the old English Church which has been tried through severe struggles; which for three hundred years and more has been identified in its present form with the national life; which neither in our fathers' time nor in ours

has been the antagonist, but always the ally and patron of learning, of science, and of the nation's growing intelligence. It may have learned a fresher and fuller toleration than was possible in the midst of its old struggles; but it is the same Church still, while God's Providence has placed it in a peculiar position for rallying round it both the lovers of antiquity and those who are imbued with a searching spirit of inquiry; while the old Churches of East and West cannot refuse it some reverence, and the newer sects feel that it is a bulwark against the return to exploded superstitions; it seems peculiarly pointed out as a centre of union for the long-divided faith of Christians. In it we hold that Christendom has the surest bulwark, both of sound faith and sound morals, against the encroachments of a threatening infidelity.

Let me, in conclusion, recall what is told us of a remarkable man, who went to his rest in Christ some ten years ago, and whose letters have lately been published; the friend

and in some sort the guide of Frederick Maurice. He had long been esteemed a prophet among the disciples of an advanced school of Christian thought. In the midst of his speculations he had certainly lived a saintly life. It is said that as death drew near, in his old age, during the last few days, all the abstruse questions which had troubled him in life disappeared. He felt that it was on the old familiar truths of his boyhood that he had now a firm grasp. On these he dwelt as life ebbed. It was leaning on these that he entered into the presence of the Saviour he had ever loved. A lesson here surely both for individual Christians and for Churches. It has been noted also that the latter sermons preached by Dr. Arnold, before he was prematurely taken from the Church on earth in his forty-seventh year, to the sorrow of all good men, are marked by an earnest clinging to the great central doctrines of Christianity, and a vivid inculcation of them in their fulness on the souls

for whose spiritual good he yearned. He was a man fearless in speculation, and had known many harassing doubts; but the deepening experience of a devout life, and his ripening conviction of the realities of that eternal world which, though imperceptibly, he was nearing, had on his noble spirit that same effect which life's trials and the felt nearness of God may be expected to produce on all the most earnest truth-loving souls. So it seems to me that the Church of Christ, amid distracting speculations and the growth around it of dangerous error, will learn to cling only the more closely to the great central truths of the Gospel of its salvation.

VI.

PRACTICAL COUNSELS FOR ITS WORK.

(*Delivered at Maidstone, on September 28th, to the Rural Deanery of Sutton.*)

My Reverend Brethren, and my Brethren the Churchwardens, — The purport of this last address of my present visitation is to set forth certain practical matters in which I believe we, in our separate spheres, may best promote the usefulness of that great and venerable institution of which we are members. We have received the Church of England from our fathers: we trust by God's blessing to hand it down unimpaired to our successors, and it is our hearts' desire to make it in every way subserve the great purpose of

advancing the cause of Christ. The Church consists of its clergy and its laity, and on both, in the sphere of usefulness proper to each, great duties devolve. No layman, as no clergyman, can, in any position of life in which he is placed, divest himself of his relations to the Church of Christ of which he is a member. As citizens we must act in all things according to our highest convictions; so also as men of business, and in the intercourse of society. The Gospel has come into the world for the express purpose of raising the standard of our thoughts and actions, and each failure by which we sink below the standard is a forgetfulness of our allegiance to Christ. It is one of the chief characteristics of the Church of England that it insists primarily and chiefly on those great doctrines which are common to the whole Christian world. I am not, therefore, speaking here of the distinctions which separate one branch of Christ's universal Church from another; but I am protesting against a lax view, not uncommon in the present day, which

would tell men that, though they are Christians, they may throw their Christianity aside when they enter on their civil duties, and be content in their relations to the State and in their business transactions to be heathens, while on Sundays and in the Church they make profession of Christianity. Such attempts remind one of the old story of the Elector-Archbishop on the Rhine who, when reproached with the profaneness of his language, said that he was speaking only as a temporal prince, and that he would speak very differently in his character as Archbishop. The answer was, "When the Elector goes to his place of punishment for his profanity, how will the Archbishop separate himself from his company?" A Christian takes his Christianity with him, for better or for worse, in all conditions of life. In every relation in which he can possibly stand, it is inseparable from him; it is part of himself, if he has in truth any real connexion with it. Modern theories of the isolation of our Christianity from the living, breathing, acting life

which environs us every day in a Christian State are a delusion. It is high time that men should make up their minds whether or not they are ready, not only to make their bow to Christianity on certain stated occasions, but to let it be avowedly the guide and motive power of all their life.

And if this applies to all the laity, I am right, I think, especially to urge it upon you who, holding those lay offices which our own branch of the Church maintains in every parish, have a sort of mixed character in your near relations to the clergy. If even the ordinary citizen in such a nation as ours cannot separate his secular from his distinctly religious duties, this applies with increased force to all who hold secular or semi-secular offices in the direct service of the Church. It is very satisfactory, then, to observe how the office of churchwarden is each year more prized in its true character, and that, too, at a time when its duties have become much more difficult than they were, and when the patronage and other influence

that formerly attached to it has, by legislative enactment, been greatly diminished. I am truly thankful to observe at each of my places of visitation how many churchwardens come forward to join their brethren of the clergy in the Holy Communion. This is, I trust, a sign of the growing appreciation of the true importance and sacred character of their official duties, and also, indirectly, of a growing appreciation of that more widely-reaching truth of which we have been speaking — that every citizen in England has his religious as well as his secular duties, and that the two are indissolubly connected.

I will here mention, by the way, that a clergyman who is able to work harmoniously with his churchwardens will certainly find his burdens thereby greatly lightened, and if, here and there, he feels that their views differ from his own, and act as a check on what he desires to introduce as a salutary improvement, it will be well for him to remember that they have better opportunities than himself of knowing

the feelings of that section of the laity among whom they move, and that, even if at times they are unduly obstructive, not much is to be done by a rude over-riding of his people's prejudices. More will be gained by conciliatory attempts to settle differences through kindly intercourse than can possibly be lost by the interval of time required for effecting such conciliation. I must, indeed, as on former occasions, urge the laity not to be unreasonable in such matters. It will never do to stop all improvement in the outward form of our public worship till such time as there is a universal consent to its adoption, and every captious objection has been silenced. Those of us whose memories go back fifty years must remember how dreary, and even slovenly, were of old the arrangements in many of our parish churches. We must grant that it has been to the zeal of our clergy, stimulated by the good taste of what was usually but a minority of their parishioners, that changes, now acknowledged by all to be improvements, were introduced. The point I urge is not that all

changes are to be stopped, but that they are only to be introduced on mature consideration when sincerely believed to be improvements with every desire and effort to make them acceptable to the people, and with dutiful reference, when any dispute arises, to the constituted authority as the rubric directs. But I trust and believe that both clergy and laity are now tired of foolish discussions on such subjects, and that the minds of both are occupied by weightier matters.

To return, may I not trust, in spite of some signs to the contrary, that in the majority, both of our clergy and our laity, there is a growing desire to recognise religious obligations of a simple Christian kind in all the duties which devolve on them in the Church and in the State? Let us pass on now to another matter. In such an age as this, it is above all things necessary that the standard of clerical efficiency shall be maintained. You are aware that over our great Universities, in the course of the reforms which have recently been introduced

into them, a wave of free thought has rolled, exalting the secular above the ecclesiastical. The result of this is that, while in this Diocese at least there is no lack of good and efficient candidates from the Universities, the number of young men of the highest University distinction at Oxford, if not at Cambridge, who seek holy orders, is, for the present at least, diminished. I trust that this state of things will not last. I believe it to have been greatly augmented by the fact that of late years a narrow and somewhat superstitious form of the Church's teaching has been too often presented as part of the necessary equipment of a clergyman. And greatly have the truest friends of the Church longed that in both our great seats of learning the Church should always be presented to the rising clergy in its truest, widest, and most intellectual aspect. We have no fear that the purity of its doctrine will suffer from the light of criticism and of history. May God's blessing be with all who are striving, under great difficulties, to train our rising youth

in a theology worthy of our Church's mission, as the great civilizing influence which is to leaven the thought and direct the energies of the coming age.

Moreover, in our Universities there has of late been a great change in respect of places of emolument—that is, scholarships and fellowships now thrown open to competition; and certainly there never was a time when it could more truly be said that a career is open to talent. But these changes, beneficial as they are, have certain drawbacks which we must face. A young man has not much chance in a competitive examination unless he has had a careful training in his boyhood, and such careful training is more easily procured by the wealthy than by the poor. Again, there may be many young men, both good and able, well fitted from the devotion and the earnestness of their character, and from other gifts, to become valuable ministers of Christ's gospel, who have no great aptitude for the particular studies as the reward for which scholarships and fellow-

ships are given. Two sets of persons, therefore, from whom we might expect an important addition to the ranks of the rising clergy—namely, clever young men who in their early boyhood have no means, and young men who, without being remarkably clever, have many solid qualities of head and heart, are under peculiar disadvantages, and require our aid. A conviction of this suggested, at one of our diocesan conferences, the establishment of a fund to enable young men of promise, desirous of entering the ministry of our Church, to be educated at our Universities.[1] It is one of the advantages of recent changes that the cost of such University education, for those who choose to exercise a wise self-denial, and to accommodate themselves to the somewhat straitened circumstances of their condition in life, is greatly reduced. An annual gift of £70 or £80 to any promising young man, whose parents cannot afford the expense of his education, will now make all the difference as to the

[1] See Appendix C.

possibility of his being trained for the ministry at the Universities. I desire anxiously that this effort on our part should be extended. The poor diocese of Bangor, to its honour, has set a good example here to all England, which I trust we shall not be slow to follow. So important has this matter appeared that, while the Cathedral Commission has been dealing with the statutes of Canterbury Cathedral, it has been suggested that one of the canons should have this special work assigned to him —to look out for such young men ; to raise and administer the funds necessary for their education ; and to superintend and guide them by advice during their University career.

It is often urged as a disadvantage of our Church system that young men are ordained so soon after leaving the University, without a peculiar training for the duties of the pastoral office. Efforts, as you are aware, are made in diocesan theological colleges to obviate this omission. I have always been strongly of opinion that attendance at such

diocesan colleges ought not, as a rule, to be accepted as a substitute for the three years of University life. We do not wish our future clergy to be of the lower Roman Catholic priest or ordinary Methodist class-leader or Scripture-reader type. We do not wish them to receive all their education in some narrow school where one theological teacher may force all the instruction given into one groove. I am free to acknowledge that a few theological colleges here and there, ably officered and well conducted, may be, and now are, a useful supplement to the University course. There are young men, well fitted for the ministry, who are all the better for being removed, at the end of their three years of University life, to some new sphere in a quiet place, where they can apply themselves to their studies, and make preparation for their life's work, at a distance from old associates. But, for the ordinary body of our theological students, I cannot see why the Universities themselves, with their great endowments, spacious libraries, and learned

professors, with all the helps to devotion which their chapel services ought to afford, may not, in the midst of the stir of life which is their characteristic, find some quiet spots where, under due rule and guidance, the future clergyman may, better than elsewhere, mature both the practical and the theoretical preparation for his life's work.

But perhaps it more concerns us to turn our thoughts to that work which the clergy must continue to prosecute for themselves when they have entered on their several spheres of professional labour. If it be true of all men and of all women who are to be well educated that their most important education begins when they have left school or college, this is especially true of the clergy. It is not among the poor only that we may find examples of persons well taught in youth whose progress stops with their youth, and for whom, therefore, their early training proves useless, even if it be not forgotten. The bishops do not fail to urge upon the candidates for deacons' orders that

the year before they are ordained priests must be used for study as well as practical work. These deacons have reached that very time of life at which the importance of the books they read opens before them with fresh attractions, as they learn more clearly to understand by practical observation their bearing on man's highest interests. Disquisitions on what before seemed abstract points of theology or philosophy are warmed to life when we see how such questions affect human souls. It is for this reason that we rigidly uphold a high standard in the examination of candidates for priests' orders. I fear the elder clergy sometimes scarcely appreciate the importance of our doing so. Excuses are made—"I hope you will not be hard on my curate, for he has not had a moment to read, he has been entirely occupied with his parish work; he has had to preach three sermons a week." I answer, "Alas! for his parishioners." How can an ordinary inexperienced young man of three-and-twenty evolve each week out of his own

brain three regular addresses, which will really reach the hearts and consciences, instruct the intellects, and guide the lives of his people? Much reading will not make a man a good preacher, still less will little reading; but this is certain, that without reading the man is sure to be an indifferent, uninstructive, ineffective preacher. I do not mean that he is necessarily to read much, but he must read really and to the purpose, for however short a time each day; note what he reads, and accustom himself to carry on suggestive trains of thought. Granted that the best preacher is the man who touches the heart and thus influences the life; granted that many gifts of voice, manner, tenderness of sympathetic feeling, and terseness of expression are required, if the words of the wise preacher are to be as goads that prick the conscience, as nails driven home to the heart and fastening themselves in the memory; granted, above all, that no man can preach effectively what he does not himself feel; granted that there are many gifts besides fulness of knowledge which

are required for good preaching; yet without knowledge, in this age especially, the sermon will often be a stumbling-block to some intelligent member of the congregation. It is sometimes said to be a virtue carried to a fault in the Church of England that all our clergy are expected to be preachers—a fault the very opposite of that into which the Oriental Churches have fallen, where there is very little preaching. But whether this be a fault or not, it is indispensable to our system—we must all preach. We cannot, indeed, all be great preachers, but in the highest sense we can all be good preachers, if we give of our best with great care, and try to overcome every obstacle which mars our efficiency; if we store our minds as well as we can, and speak to our people with a hearty love of souls. Surely, our theme—the life, and death, and resurrection of Christ, and His ever-living intercession, and the gift of the Holy Spirit—must inspire us with earnestness when we speak to our people even of

the commonest duties of their every-day life.

But besides the spiritual element in our preaching, nothing will excuse us for not adding to our stores all we can, whereby we may make our instruction more attractive; and study will be required that we may gain a deeper and fuller understanding of Holy Scripture, with a deeper insight into the way in which its truths and precepts have moulded the lives of God's people, under varying circumstances, in all ages. A wider knowledge, also, of the motives of action, and of the temptations and trials which beset human life, will be gained by him who carefully reads history and biography, and observes beyond the limits of his own personal experience. We must not make mistakes as to the common truths of physical science, if we would have influence with the more intelligent even of the mechanics who are brought under our care. We must not be ignorant of the works of the great masters in poetry and oratory, if we would

know and reach the feelings of our people; and it would be preposterous that we should seek to guide any but the most ignorant, if we knew nothing of the currents of philosophical thought which are bearing on many of the most earnest of the young around us to conclusions with which their fathers never troubled themselves. All these things show that the wise clergyman will strive, as far as circumstances allow, to make himself, in Bacon's phrase, a "full man." His early training for his profession must aim at this. He must aim at this afterwards in the higher education he continues for himself throughout all his days. No amount of personal goodness will in these times compensate for the want of life and energy, if he allows himself to settle down into a mere vegetative state. If it be but a few souls that are committed to him, and they, for the most part, uninstructed people, it certainly will require much art and labour, added to earnestness of purpose, to enable him by his discourses to penetrate their somewhat dense

understandings. And tremendous are the issues for these souls, one by one, which, all experience shows, must hang upon the question whether our preaching is effective to reach them or fal's on dull ears. I advise every clergyman in a remote country place to be very careful lest he stagnate, either morally or intellectually. If he stagnates, so will his people. I advise you in such districts carefully to maintain and give life to those meetings for mutual discussion and for devotion which ought to be common in all our rural deaneries. Think not lightly of the task committed to the pastor in the very smallest parish. It is a blessed work to which he is called who is surrounded by a flock so manageable that he can know every family, and make himself the personal guide and friend of each member of the family, from the grandsire to the little children. And perhaps, measured by the highest standard, the life of such a pastor, who is earnest and real in his work, is among the happiest which this world can offer.

Have I seemed to dwell too much on the intellectual side of your responsibilities? It is difficult, in our profession as the Christian instructors of our countrymen, to define sharply the limit which separates our intellectual from our devotional sphere of work. Let all who learn and all you who have to teach be sanctified by prayer, by thoughts of your own weakness and of God's willingness to give you strength, and of the eternal interests with which you have to deal. It is impossible here to go into all the practical matters which a bishop visiting his clergy might wish to bring before them. Your direct private pastoral intercourse with the old and young of each family under your care, the great opportunities for making and deepening good impressions as the periodical confirmations come round, an opportunity similar to that of which the priests of the Church of Rome make so effective a use at the time of the first Communion—these and many like matters must now be passed over.

Perhaps the defect will in part be supplied by the suggestions of those visitation questions which I have issued.

Before I close I shall dwell only on two other points. In these days, when so much depends upon keeping alive the good social relations which bind the rich and the poor, when many attempts are, unfortunately, made to set class against class, in antagonism to the whole spirit of the Gospel, you will do well to think nothing unimportant which will bring you into friendly relations with your people, and enable you to help the poor among them to raise themselves in the social scale. You will not forget that you have a heavenly commission and a heavenly message to deliver both to rich and poor, and this thought will be with you while you join even in their amusements. All the members of your flock ought to be made to feel that you take a real interest in their welfare. And as to the poor, as I have said, their efforts to better themselves, the best means of directing

their attention to habits of thrift and improved industry, their plans for emigration, or for obtaining better wages by extending at home the field in which they seek for work, —in all these things it is the part of a true Christian pastor to aid all the less instructed of his people. I think that he will be able in many ways quietly to influence both rich and poor to a better understanding of their dependence one on the other, and of their reciprocal duties in the body politic. I am not urging the clergy to mix themselves up unduly with their people's secular affairs, but nothing is really secular which promotes Christian good feeling between man and man, and enables duties to be performed as in the sight of God and Christ which might otherwise have been neglected.

There is still one other special domain from which I trust our clergy will never find themselves excluded—the Christian instruction of our youth. I trust that our present direct influence in our elementary schools may long

be continued to us; that as a sacred duty you may regard it as part of your daily task to visit these schools, and see that religious instruction is properly conducted; that you may seek out your pupil-teachers and other advanced scholars and draw them closely under your personal influence and instruction. And even if, unfortunately, here and there, the common schools pass from under your direct control, I trust that this will but make you redouble your efforts to give life and reality to some well-regulated system at fixed hours, when, by Sunday-schools or otherwise, you can gather the young together for directly religious instruction. It is a lamentable consideration that England has hitherto been more backward than she ought to have been in providing the blessings of education for every class of her children. All know and acknowledge how much the clergy of the Church of England have of late done in this great work; but even now deplorable instances are to be found among us of children growing to maturity in the grossest

ignorance. My own experience as the head of a large family of servants is, that well-grown and tolerably intelligent lads are to be found in some country parishes, whose slight training at school has never given them any real knowledge, and when examined at the age of eighteen or nineteen they are found to know nothing. You will not fail to satisfy yourselves that the least advanced, as well as the cleverest of the children in your schools, are really profiting by the instruction placed within their reach, and, more especially with respect to religious instruction, that what they are taught is not merely formally accepted, but understood. For example, I think you will act wisely if each of you, in your schools, will satisfy yourselves by individual questioning as to the prayers which the children offer up morning and evening in their homes. A child trained in habits of prayer may, by a quiet example, become a missionary to a whole family which would otherwise live without God.

Neither will you leave the young people of your flock to wander unattended when they

approach the dangerous threshold of mature life; then, more than at any other time, they require a helping hand. Where would any of us clergy be, if, at that raw and inexperienced age at which we left school, we had been plunged, without restraint or guidance, into the world's temptations? It was then that the discipline and regulations of our colleges became our safeguards, when, if left to ourselves, we could not have used aright the liberty which our age had brought us. And are we to believe that the young plough-boy, artisan, or apprentice is more able to guide himself than the young clergyman's or squire's son? For the less refined, it must be remembered, unprincipled men have provided in this age a complete deluge of immoral and debasing literature, which will sweep away all the pure instruction they have received in childhood if some friend be not at hand to direct them. I am sure the clergy I address will not fail to give this subject their most serious consideration.

And now I must close this visitation—that

part of it, at least, which is formally and publicly conducted. As I have said before, the greater part of the practical visitation of the diocese is connected with the answers to the printed questions placed in your hands which you have now returned to me or my officers. By these I expect to have a distinct view of the position of each parish in the diocese brought before me, and I shall not fail to communicate with you individually, where necessary, that we may mutually assist each other in the accomplishment of the great work committed to us. It must be quite uncertain whether I shall have another opportunity of thus meeting the whole diocese on visitation —certainly we who have gathered together this year can never, all of us, meet again. Also since, if God spares my life, I shall soon enter on my seventieth year, and I have now almost completed the twenty-fourth year of my episcopate, it can scarcely be expected that even if life and health are spared to me to enter on another visitation, I shall again be

equal to the labour I have imposed on myself of addressing the diocese in separate charges at so many different stations. I have been anxious, therefore, on this occasion to leave on record my matured conviction of the nature of certain pressing difficulties which in this age, in my judgment, greatly oppose the progress of the Church of Christ in this land and, indeed, throughout the civilized world. I have been anxious also to set before you somewhat in detail what I conceive to be the special mission of our own branch of Christ's Church. May God enable all of us, clergy and laity, rightly to measure our dangers and to do our part manfully in resisting them.

I suppose when a bishop closes his charge he always feels that there are many important matters on which he would wish to dwell, which he has left untouched. It is so certainly to-day. I will, however, only once again call upon you all, clergy and laity alike, to lay seriously to heart the great responsibility of our position as ministers and office-bearers of the Church

of Christ established in this realm. In crowded towns, amid the multiplicity of pressing cares, which the aggregation of human beings brings with it, in lonely rural districts where the very absence of such peculiar difficulties brings its own temptations and trials, you, clergy and laity alike, have to uphold the Church of Christ in that form in which we have received it from our fathers, and in which we verily believe it is well fitted to resist the opposition of immorality and infidelity and dull indifference. We are all of us watchmen and stewards in our several degrees, each with our separate work; God give us grace to do it. To the clergy especially I would say in closing that I well know, and I trust shall ever sympathise with, the difficulties that beset them. As years advance I trust we learn to know each other better, and more fully to enter into each other's feelings. You will not fail to pray for me, and I certainly shall pray earnestly for the clergy and laity of this diocese.

VII.

ADDRESS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CATHEDRAL BODY.

(*Delivered in Canterbury Cathedral, on September 25th.*)

My Reverend Brethren and other Members of the Cathedral Body,—I appear among you to-day as visitor under somewhat peculiar circumstances. You are aware that it has seemed good to Her Majesty to issue a commission of inquiry into the condition of the various cathedral bodies, and especially to call the attention of the commissioners to the propriety of drawing up new statutes in lieu of any which may have become obsolete or unfitted for the present times; and you are

probably aware that Her Majesty has thought good to appoint me to the office of president or chairman of this Royal commission. Therefore, as visitor here to-day, some may expect that I should throw some light on the views which have occurred to the commissioners in reference to the duties which Her Majesty has devolved upon them. You are aware, however, that the range of subjects which is submitted to this commission is very wide. It would be premature and improper for me to attempt to speak in the name of my brother commissioners on an occasion of this kind. Of course, as we have taken the metropolitical cathedral as the first which we have investigated, it will not be unnatural that I should give expression, in the course of this charge, to opinions which have been floating in the minds of the commissioners. But these cannot as yet be supposed to have any distinct consistency.

One point is obvious, that it is the duty of the commissioners to recommend to Her Majesty a readjustment of the statutes of the

various cathedrals, and I think I shall be betraying no confidence if I say that it is of the very essence of this arrangement with reference to the statutes, that some clause shall be introduced into them which shall give power for altering statutes from time to time, under the sanction of some august authority, so as in after times to adapt the arrangements of the various cathedrals to changing circumstances in every age. Great care, of course, is required in the alteration of ancient statutes which have come down to us with the authority of so long a prescription ; and great care will be wanted in constructing the particular statute which shall give the power of alteration of statutes in after times. As to two points, then, I think there is no doubt : that we are likely to have new statutes suggested, and that those new statutes will contain a power of alteration.

And now let me proceed more distinctly to my duties in this visitation. A visitation, I presume, is intended to call upon all of us to consider how far we are fulfilling the ideal or

intention with which our great institution has been founded. I say we, because such an investigation, conducted with all the solemnity which has attended our gathering at this time, puts certain searching questions to every one of us, from the visitor, to whom great duties are confided, down to the youngest King's scholar or chorister connected with this great cathedral. We have to ask ourselves how far, by God's help, we are doing our several duties to the institution of which we are all members. It may be that it is but in some small matters, as they are reckoned by the outside world, that we are failing, but every failure, either in the old or the young among us, ought to be noted at such a solemn time as this, and noted with a view to improvement in the future. We are gathered to-day in a very venerable fabric, which speaks to us on every side of the passing nature of those opportunities which are given to us, as individuals, for the fulfilment of the several duties committed to us by God. We are here in the midst of the monuments of very old time, amid memorials of the

history of our country, over the graves of great men who have done great works in former days. It is something to feel ourselves, from the oldest to the youngest, united in this great institution, and, we hope, animated by the associations which this building and its institutions call to our minds.

Now, our cathedral, like every other cathedral, has its own peculiar characteristics. It would be a great mistake if those who desire to make arrangements for the cathedrals in this country were to treat them all exactly alike. A list of them lies before me, in which some one has marked those which belong to the old, and those which belong to the new, foundation—a very broad distinction indeed, the particulars of which I need not enter into at present. But, besides this great distinction running through them all, who, for example, would for a moment consider that the great cathedral of St. Paul's, in the centre of the centre of the civilized world, was like the cathedral of St. David's on the rocks of Wales, in a small village

consisting of a few farmhouses? Who would suppose that Durham, with its magnificent endowments and its great University under the shadow of its walls, was exactly like, let us say, Llandaff? There must be the greatest distinction between the different cathedrals; and though it is perfectly true that some similar principles will be found to pervade them all, yet he would be a most unwise reformer of our cathedral bodies who would apply to them any stereotyped system of improvement, which might be extremely useful for one, but would altogether fail of any usefulness for another. I trust that any such vain attempt will be avoided, that every cathedral will be dealt with according to its own particular characteristics and the circumstances that surround it.

When I say that a visitation calls upon us to consider the ideal of our cathedral existence, this may be understood in two senses. There is the old ideal which existed in the mind of the original founders, in an age extremely unlike our present age, and in very different

circumstances from those in which we find ourselves. One of the difficulties which has beset the cathedral bodies in late times has been this, that they have not been able distinctly to realise—and it is impossible to realise—the ideal which is contained in their ancient statutes, because the whole state of society, since these statutes were written, has entirely changed, and things, which were admirably suited for the days when cathedrals were originally founded, have altogether ceased to be capable of being applied to the exigencies of the present times. And what has been the result of this? There may have been no change of statutes outwardly; but every man of intelligence knows that the greatest of all changes are those which take place while outwardly there appears to be no change. A man lives, say, in the same house, surrounded by many of the same outward conveniences, and even by the same faces, from childhood to old age, but the man is changing year by year, and if he attempts in his old age, or

in the vigour of his manhood, to accommodate himself to what was fit for his childhood, he may fancy to himself that he is remaining unchanged; but an imperceptible change has been going on, far greater than any that could have come by a change of outward arrangement. And so, I think, we shall find, as of the Universities, so also of the cathedrals, that the maintenance of old statutes is very often synonymous with a departure from their spirit. And hence there has grown up in every old society such as this a number of traditionary explanations of statutes which have really set them aside. Customs have come to be as powerful as statutes—customs about which no one exactly knows when they sprang into existence, and therefore, from their venerable antiquity, they have become as powerful as the statutes which virtually they have set aside. Now, it seems to me that it is wise carefully to look through our old statutes and to reconsider our old customs, not with the view of setting aside anything in them which is excellent, nor,

I believe, with a view in any respect to violating their spirit, but of seeing that the letter and the spirit more completely agree than they do in the present state of things. We are to look to the ideal of our cathedral. Are we to suppose ourselves, then, in the days in which this was an ancient monastery, going back to Norman times, or even beyond? Or are we even to throw ourselves into the Reformation age, when our monastery changed into a cathedral entrusted to secular clergy; or are we, as living men, with duties committed to us by the Lord Whom we serve, to face manfully the difficulties that are around us in the age in which we live, and to endeavour to see that these great institutions, which we have received from unknown antiquity, shall be made as much to serve our Lord and Master in the changing circumstances of the present day as they did when they sprang from the hands of their founders in the old times that are past? Therefore we have, in looking to the ideal of our cathedral, to look both back to what was

originally intended, and to look around us now to see how far the original intentions are capable of being applied usefully, as in God's sight, to the changing circumstances of the present age.

Now, one thing is certain, that in the minds of those who originally founded these institutions, or reformed them at the time of the Reformation, they were intended to be centres of religious life. It is a very serious question for us to ask ourselves at this moment how far this great institution of ours is, as I trust it is, the centre of religious life and of religious light to this diocese, and in its degree, to the whole Church. This is a question we have to propound to ourselves. Every one of us has a part to bear in giving life to this ideal, from the visitor, as I have said before, down to the youngest student who is engaged in preparing himself for life in the King's School. There can be no harm in praising the exertions which have been made in other cathedrals, though it would be very undesirable that, gathered here

to-day, we should begin to praise ourselves. Let us see, therefore, if we can find any other cathedral which, under very difficult circumstances, is endeavouring to fulful this great duty of being the centre of light and of worship where God has placed it. It must be granted that St. Paul's Cathedral has no easy task, in the very centre of modern civilization, surrounded by four millions of people, a vast number of whom have no connexion with the Church which St. Paul's typifies. Yet I am bound to say that, during late years, a great work has been done in that cathedral. No one can enter it on a weekday or on Sunday without seeing that it has laid hold of the hearts of the people of that great metropolis. No one can doubt that there is life and energy within it, and that it is becoming, as much as the altered circumstances of the times allow, very much the centre of religious life in that overwhelming metropolis. Now, this is the sort of ideal which ought to be present to the minds of all who would improve any one of our cathedrals. It

is, I trust, present to our minds, and that we do endeavour, as far as adverse circumstances allow, to fulfil it. We have to ask ourselves to-day whether we can fulfil it better. The thing is not impossible—that is plain. Much may be done. Difficulties stand in our way, but those difficulties will disappear if we brace ourselves to our work with an earnest purpose to work as in God's sight.

When we speak of the cathedral as the centre of religious life, first we have its worship. And we are met here together to ask ourselves to-day whether, in all respects, our worship is as perfect as it might be. I am sure there is an earnest desire on the part of all of us to make it as perfect as possible. Our music should be beautiful, elevating, edifying, above all, devotional. A great deal of skill, a great deal of time, a great deal of self-discipline will be required if we are to bring even this one part of our work to the perfection which it is capable of attaining. But in the worship of Protestant cathedrals,

musical services, and even devotional services, always go hand-in-hand with instruction. The manner of reading the Word of God may seem a little matter, but it is very important for us to consider with ourselves whether the reading of the Word of God, as an important point in all our church services, is as perfect as it ought to be; whether those who casually enter our cathedral, coming it may be by some excursion train, and remaining for the service, hearing the Word of God read, may fairly be expected to carry away with them some striking sentence from Holy Writ which may be of use to them in their after lives. And if the reading of the Word of God, so the preaching of the Word of God. We have all of us, who are ordained ministers of Christ, carefully to consider with ourselves whether our preaching does answer the great purpose for which the Lord sent us forth to preach the Gospel to every creature. In every cathedral with which I am acquainted there are old arrangements about preaching

which I am bound to say I think might be improved. Why should people be tied down to some routine, unless it is found that that routine produces the very best possible result? Therefore, I should not be surprised if the commissioners who are appointed to consider the condition of our cathedral bodies were to suggest that some alteration might profitably be made in this matter. Of course, with the learned divines and able men that we have here, we ought to be free from the imputations which have been made as to other cathedrals elsewhere; but even we may not have attained that absolute standard of such perfection as is attainable. I have heard it said elsewhere, of other cathedrals, that if you want to hear dull sermons in a diocese, you had better go to the centre of the diocese, and there you are likely to hear them. I do not for a moment say that that is the case here. But still it is quite possible that even here some wiser arrangement might be devised than that which has stereotyped a system which makes the tenure

of a particular office, rather than a fitness to address the souls of the people who frequent the cathedral, the qualification for addressing them from the pulpit. I will not dwell further upon this: but I think that it is a matter which might well engage the attention of the cathedral bodies, whether, somehow or other, more elasticity may not be given to the preaching rota, whereby, without losing any of that great authority which naturally belongs to the principal preachers of our great cathedrals, we might occasionally have more life. No doubt much has been done in this respect in late years. To refer again to St. Paul's, which has its disadvantages and difficulties, but also its advantages, there is no doubt that since I first became acquainted with the Diocese of London, twenty-four years ago, the whole system has been there entirely altered. The custom of introducing extraneous preachers, at special evening services on Sunday, began in the metropolis at Westminster Abbey, under Dean Trench, and Dean Milman speedily followed

the example at St. Paul's. The best preachers in England one after another are now to be heard in these two cathedrals, whether they belong to the cathedral body or whether they do not. You will hear on Sunday evenings the most eminent theologians and the best preachers in the whole Church of England—I might say, the best that are to be found anywhere. And though a cathedral in a country town is very differently circumstanced in this respect from a cathedral in the great central metropolis, yet still you will be acting wisely, I am sure, in this cathedral, in more completely opening the pulpit, as you have partially opened it of late years. By means even of what you have already done the old stereotyped system has somewhat given way to the introduction of fresh life, and I trust that all have benefited by it.

Again, if our cathedral is to be the centre of religious life and of worship and of preaching, we all are reminded, every time we enter the precincts of this cathedral, that it is to be

the centre of religious life in the way of education; and here I am bound to say that I think nothing has been wanting in the arrangements of this cathedral body for making the educational establishments connected with it as efficient and useful as they possibly can be. And I am sure that in those who teach, and in those who preside over the regulation of our educational establishments, there is an earnest spirit and a determination to make our schools efficient, as religious Church of England schools. I hope the time may come when our choristers' school may be improved. It makes a very great difference as to the usefulness of our cathedral services whether the boys who compose the choir, and whose very occupation, while it is one of privilege, is also one of considerable temptation, be thoroughly and devotionally trained. I believe it is granted that if the means were at hand much might be done to improve this cathedral in this respect. To turn again to the central cathedral of the metropolis. With the abundant wealth which that body possesses,

it has established a great choristers' school which is in many respects likely to be a model. It may be very difficult, with our crippled resources, to accomplish the same good work which has been done there. But I am sure that there is every desire on the part of those who govern this cathedral to make the choristers' school as efficient as is the great King's School attached to our body.

We are honoured to-day by a very large assemblage of those who, some twenty-five years ago, would not have existed in this cathedral institution—our honorary Canons. I think that, even with the little that has as yet been done to attach them distinctly to the cathedral body, they have been of great use in connecting the cathedral with the diocese. The fact of a number of men who have worked hard in their several parishes, bearing even an honorary name which connects them with the great central cathedral, has a good effect in the whole diocese. Some people think the honorary Canons ought to manage the cathe-

drals. I do not think we are likely to have a revolutionary change of that kind. But I think that it is very desirable indeed that in this respect the cathedrals of the new foundation should be more assimilated to the cathedrals of the old. You are aware, probably, that some years ago Mr. Randolph, a prebendary of St. Paul's, tested, in a court of law, the rights of the old prebendal chapter of St. Paul's as compared with the rights of the residentiary chapter. All that was established was this (but it was an important point as far as it went), that non-residentiary prebendaries, answering very much to our honorary canons, though, of course, of an older foundation, are entitled, with the lesser chapter, to vote for the election of proctors in Convocation. And, accordingly, the election of proctors in Convocation is now an election conducted in that cathedral by the whole body of non-residentiary as well as residentiary canons. It certainly has occurred to many persons that it would be no inconvenience, but quite the

reverse, to associate the honorary canons of our cathedrals of the new foundation with the residentiary canons in such duties as that which has been claimed and vindicated for them in the case to which I have alluded. And once having established that these honorary canons may be called together for the purpose of these elections, it naturally suggests itself to us that there may be other circumstances also under which the bishop or the dean or the canons residentiary may desire to confer with them ; and that, therefore, meetings of these honorary canons in a greater chapter might by no means be a disadvantage, but of great use to the Church and to the diocese.

With regard to the governing body, it is difficult, I think, to say exactly what was the original ideal on which the residentiary canon's office was established. But there is no difficulty in my mind in saying what is the sort of ideal which is suitable for this present age. Our Universities, from a change of circumstances which we may greatly deplore, but

which we cannot alter, are severing, more and more, their formal connection with the Church. If the Church is to maintain, in an age like this, the high position which it has ever maintained on account of learning, we must have positions for learned men. I may speak in the presence of the residentiaries of this cathedral with perfect freeness on this subject, for I believe it will be difficult to produce any cathedral in the kingdom, the names of the members of which are better known as learned men than are the residentiaries of the cathedral in which we are now assembled. I trust that this characteristic of our cathedral body will ever be maintained. Study, however, is not inconsistent with some outward activity. We, in our cathedral body, have two officers whose business it is to co-operate with the Bishop in the management of this important diocese. I believe I may fairly say, that if it were not for the assistance which I personally receive from the two archdeacons, it would be impossible with any satisfaction to carry on the

work of the Diocesan Episcopate as connected with the duties of the Archbishop of Canterbury. And yet I do not think that even the onerous duties which devolve upon the archdeacons interfere with their being learned men. Certain changes as regards the Canons Residentiary have, I am free to confess, been proposed. Whether they will be carried into effect or not is quite another matter. But it may be well that we here should know what sort of changes have been proposed, and consider for ourselves how far they are good. One is that a point in the ancient statutes which seems in many cathedrals, if not in this, to have been somewhat overlooked, should be reasserted—namely, the controlling authority of the dean, assisted by the precentor, in the whole management and the arrangement of the cathedral services. I do not know that this is not the case here already, but it is not the case in all cathedrals—that I can testify. It is true that in the multitude of counsellors there is wisdom, but if you

wish to manage your parishes well, do you think it would be a good plan for the management of them that you should always call a meeting of the whole rural deanery when you wish to make the slightest change or improvement in the arrangement of your parish church? And that you should be bound hand and foot not to make any change till you had persuaded the whole body of the rural deanery to agree to what you think best for your parish church? I believe that this sort of divided responsibility is the most admirable of all machinery for preventing improvements. If we wish to improve we must throw upon the members individually the responsibilities which we call upon them to fulfil. And I believe that this was the ideal of the original statutes—that certain officers, as the executive, had great duties committed to them which it was left to their individual responsibility, acting to the best of their judgment, adequately to fulfil. The central body met to lay down great principles from time to time, but it considered that, having

elected certain officers, or having received certain officers elected by others, those officers had their distinct duties to perform. Usually, the dean of the cathedral had a very distinct office to perform as regulator of the whole, and, with the assistance of the precentor acting under him, was to be considered as responsible for the services of the Church.

What, then, is the duty of the canons? There are various offices which the old statutes prescribed as falling to the canons. These offices ought to be made, as much as possible, realities, and in some cathedrals the Chancellor of the old foundation carries on the work of instruction. You all know what has been going on in this matter at Lincoln. You know how similar views have been imported into the now scarcely formed cathedral at Truro. This, at all events, is certain, that some duties connected with instruction—and instruction which shall extend beyond the limits of the actual cathedral body—may most legitimately and properly be committed to certain of

the members of the residentiary chapter. It has been found in some places that lectures delivered in great centres of the diocese by members of the chapter have been of use. How far any system of this kind can be incorporated into our existing cathedral system here in Canterbury I am not prepared at the present moment to say; but I do not despair that something of the kind may take effect. We have lately been making considerable exertions to secure some means of sending deserving candidates for holy orders to the Universities.[1] Several young men are at this moment maintained at the Universities by a diocesan fund. It seems at once to open up a sphere of usefulness for some one of our residentiary body that he should take the management of these young men more distinctly under his control, correspond with them, direct them in their work, and generally look after their progress, and see that they are making good use of the assistance which the diocese affords to them. In some

[1] *Vide* Appendix C.

places a theological college has been established in connexion with cathedrals. You are aware that we discussed this subject at some length at one of our diocesan conferences, and it was decided that, upon the whole, it was not desirable for the present, at least, to establish such a diocesan theological college. But something of the kind in the way of assisting these young students who are sent from our diocese to prepare for the ministry may certainly be incorporated with advantage in our cathedral system

Again, this town of Canterbury contains, if I am right, eighteen churches. It ought to be a model town with so many clergymen to look after comparatively few people, and I hope and trust it is. But this suggests whether, somehow or other, members of the cathedral body might not take more under their care than they have done, according to the traditions of past times, the different parishes clustered round the cathedral. Some scheme of this kind I certainly hope will be ventilated and reduced to some useful form. Now many people are anxious that our canons

should do nothing whatever but be canons. I do not know that this is a very good thing. If you find a distinct work for a man it is very desirable that he should be present in the sphere in which his work lies. And no doubt the diocese has a prior claim to other places on the cathedral as its centre. But our cathedrals do not wholly belong to a particular diocese, they belong to the Church. We cannot forget that here it is not, as in some cathedrals, the diocesan who has to fill up every office in the residentiary body. On the contrary, most of those who come to us are eminent men selected by Her Majesty's advisers or by Her Majesty herself and sent down, thereby proclaiming our connexion not merely with the diocese of Canterbury, but with the whole Church. I believe, for example, that the University is the better for its connexion with the Church through the canon-professor, and that the cathedral, as well as the diocese, is also the better for its connexion with the University through the

professor-canon. But these, of course, are merely hints which are thrown out for consideration. When the statutes are ready to be laid before Her Majesty, and before they have been finally approved, they will be submitted to the residentiary body, that they may give what advice seems to them desirable on the subject.

There are two points I have omitted. The duty of the minor canons and the duty of the Six-preachers. Efforts will certainly be made to render the relations of both these offices to the chapter more satisfactory. Modifications will, no doubt, be suggested in the tenure of the offices, and improvement sought in other respects. We must all feel how greatly the efficiency of the daily services depends upon the careful and loving discharge of their duties by the minor canons.

We have heard a good deal in the Diocese of late about the office of Six-preacher. I cannot say I think this office answers at the present moment either to the ideal which was in the mind of the person who founded it, or to that

second ideal of usefulness in supplying the wants of the present day. I suppose the congregations which they address are not very numerous and that from no fault of their own, because, as I understand, they generally preach on days when there are not likely to be very large congregations. I am aware that if their congregations are not large, neither are their stipends; and it is hardly to be expected that a man can devote his energies to a work of this kind, when he has other pressing duties elsewhere, and when the arrangements made for the office are of the insufficient kind which they are at present. Therefore it has been suggested that it would be a very good thing to diminish the number of the Six-preachers, and to increase their pay, assigning to them at the same time more distinct duties, such as were contemplated in the original foundation of their office, duties which I think no one can doubt are very much required now, as they were when the office was originally established. Preachers who shall circulate through the diocese, selected

for their fitness to discharge the office, and so remunerated that it will be possible for them to give their time and attention to it, may be a most useful adjunct to every cathedral in the country; and other cathedrals which have not the advantage of this arrangement in their statutes may benefit by following the suggestions made by our statues.

But there is a very common-place difficulty which remains at the end of all our arrangements, and it is this; that the work is infinite, and the material for the performance of it, or the adequate discharge of it, is very limited indeed. We spoke of what has been done by St. Paul's; we may speak of what has been done by Durham; but, though it is a sad thing to confess, yet I am afraid we must allow that the wealth of those two great bodies has been a most important factor in their being able so well to discharge the duties that have been committed to them. Besides the salaries appropriated by Act of Parliament to the members of chapter in such Cathedrals, there are, at St. Paul's and

at Durham, large public funds available to increase the usefulness of the general cathedral staff. Unfortunately this is not so here, and unless some means can be devised for increasing the funds at the disposal of this cathedral body, I am afraid we may talk of reforms to the end of our lives, and we shall find very great difficulty in accomplishing them. Now, it so happens there is a clause in an Act of Parliament passed not many years ago[1] which may help us in this matter. It was a clause introduced by the Archbishop of York, authorizing the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to apply to certain offices in the cathedrals, which were supposed to be underpaid, sufficient funds out of any estates formerly belonging to the cathedrals which are now in the hands of the Commissioners. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners are not commanded to perform this duty; they are only commanded to consider it. I am sorry that their consideration hitherto has not led to any satisfactory result. But I

[1] *Vide* Appendix D.

think it is right that we should call attention from this cathedral to the existence of this decision of the Imperial Parliament—that we should state our case clearly and distinctly, and show what are our wants and what is the comparatively moderate sum which we should be satisfied with. Parliament has given similar instructions to the Commissioners with regard to local claims in parishes, which claims have been attended to; but we think it wrong that Parliament should have called attention in the same way to local claims in our cathedrals, and that those claims should hitherto have been entirely ignored. I hope, therefore, that our projects of improvement of our cathedral body are not altogether visionary, and that they may be arranged in course of time, and that those various improvements may be brought to accomplishment by such assistance from the Commissioners as is indispensable for the discharge of our duties.

I have detained you much too long, but the subject is one which very much interests me in

connexion with this visitation and in connexion with my duties elsewhere; it is one which I persuade myself greatly interests the public; and it is one which cannot fail to be interesting to you. Before we part let us once more seriously call to mind the responsibilities which rest upon us as members of this time-honoured institution. Turn where we will, within these walls associations of the past call upon us during our brief span to fulfil the duties which God requires of us. Go into the Deanery, and you will see there pictures of great men who, in connexion with this cathedral, began or ended great careers of usefulness for the Church in which they were ornaments. Look around these walls and trace the monuments which you are passing, and from all of them voices will be heard calling each of us while our life lasts to exert ourselves for our Lord and Master.

APPENDICES.

VIII.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.—See p. 18.

I have been furnished with the following note by the Rev. R. T. Davidson, my chaplain.

A. C. C.

"The number of hymns in ordinary congregational use in our churches is very large, and probably the majority of those which have attained a wide popularity, whether among Churchmen or Nonconformists, have been written by members of the Church of England. The hymns of such Churchmen as Bishop Ken, Bishop Heber, John Keble, Isaac Williams, Dean Milman, Henry Francis Lyte, and many others, are known and loved among all Protestant denominations wherever the English tongue is spoken. In the 'Scottish Hymnal,' for example, authorised by the General Assembly for use in the Established Church of Scotland, we find hymns written by each of the above-named authors and by many other English Churchmen.

"On the other hand, the subjoined table, specifying the authorship, or reputed authorship, of about one hundred of our own best-known hymns, may serve to show how various are the sources from which many of those in general use among us have been collected. In cases where the hymn was originally written in another language, the name of the original author, and not of the translator, has been given. Some of the authors named in the last division of the list never separated themselves from the Church of England; but the school to which their sympathies belonged has been subsequently identified, however erroneously, with the Methodist movement of the last century.

"It will be obvious that the table I have drawn up makes no pretension to completeness. For some of the information it contains I am indebted to a paper read by the present Lord Chancellor at the York Church Congress in 1866.

"R. T. D."

(1). HYMNS OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

Ascribed to—		Church Hymns.	The Hymnary.	Hymns Ancient and Modern.	Hymnal Companion.	American Church Hymnal.
S. Ambrose	Now the daylight fills the sky	9	—	1	—	—
,,	O Jesu Lord of heavenly grace	10	—	2	2	—
,,	Before the ending of the day	19	70	15	—	359
,,	Almighty God, Thy throne above	—	68	—	—	—
,,	O God of truth, O Lord of might	12	—	10	—	356
,,	Come Holy Ghost, who, ever one	347	—	9	—	—
Prudentius	Earth has many a noble city	—	166	76	—	—
Synesius	Lord Jesus think on me	—	—	185	—	—
Anatolius	The day is past and over	31	73	21	16	341
Anonymous	O come all ye faithful	85	128	59	60	14

(2). MEDIÆVAL HYMNS, ETC.

Ascribed to—		Church Hymns.	The Hymnary.	Hymns Ancient and Modern.	Hymnal Companion	American Church Hymnal.
S. John of Damascus.	The day of resurrection . . .	137	287	132	142	105
Stephen the Sabaite .	Art thou weary?	333	597	254	118	514
Joseph of the Studium	O happy band of pilgrims . .	468	612	224	—	556
Godescalcus	The strain upraise of joy & praise	516	527	295	388	425
Jacobus de Benedictis	At the cross her station keeping.	—	242	117	—	—
S. Bonaventura . .	In the Lord's atoning grief . .	—	236	105	—	—
S. Bernard of Clugny.	Jerusalem the golden	395	600	228	165	493
S. Bernard of Clairvaux	O sacred head surrounded. . .	—	579	311	132	87
,, ,,	Jesu, thou joy of loving hearts .	403	—	190	274	—
,, ,,	Jesu the very thought of Thee .	—	560	178	216	455
S. Thomas Aquinas .	Thee we adore, O hidden Saviour, Thee	216	439	312	—	—
S. Thomas of Celano.	Day of wrath, O day of mourning	355	505	398	56	483
,, ,,	That day of wrath that dreadful day	—	110	206	51	3
Anonymous	Come Holy Ghost our souls inspire	346	173	157	395	137
"Bohemian Brethren's Collection" . . .	Now-God be with us for the night is closing	—	633	—	—	—
,, ,,	Christ the Lord is risen again! .	133	289	136	—	106
S. Francis Xavier . .	My God I love Thee, not because	434	568	106	—	458

(3). HYMNS WRITTEN BY INDEPENDENTS.

Isaac Watts	Come let us join our cheerful songs	348	—	299	364	208
,, ,, ...	Jesus shall reign where'er the sun	407	608	220	85	284
,, ,, ...	Lord of the worlds above . . .	423	—	—	186	157
,, ,, ...	O God our help in ages past . .	446	573	165	201	29
,, ,, ...	There is a land of pure delight .	519	—	—	163	488
,, ,, ...	How bright those glorious spirits shine	384	407	438	259	177
,, ,, ...	When I survey the wondrous cross	547	251	108	128	83
Philip Doddridge . . .	Hark the glad sound, the Saviour comes	68	113	53	45	15
,, ,, . . .	Ye servants of the Lord . . .	562	629	268	47	171
Simon Browne	Come gracious Spirit, heavenly dove	—	549	209	167	131

(4). HYMNS WRITTEN BY PRESBYTERIANS.

Richard Baxter . . .	Lord it belongs not to our care .	421	—	—	351	—
,, ,, . . .	Ye holy angels bright	560	—	—	—	—
Joseph Grigg	Jesus, and shall it ever be. . .	—	—	—	320	218
Thomas Gibbons . . .	Angels roll the rock away . . .	—	—	—	—	101
Anna L. Barbauld . .	Praise to God, immortal praise .	280	—	—	38	302
,, ,, . . .	Again the Lord of light and life.	—	12	—	140	156
Horatius Bonar . . .	A few more years shall roll . .	328	641	288	64	28
,, ,, . . .	Thy way, not mine, O Lord . .	533	645	265	340	254
,, ,, . . .	I heard the voice of Jesus say .	388	642	257	203	528

(5). HYMNS WRITTEN BY BAPTISTS.		Church Hymns.	The Hymnary.	Hymns Ancient and Modern.	Hymnal Companion.	American Church Hymnal.
Anne Steele	Father of mercies in Thy word .	—	—	—	198	360
,, ,, ...	Father, whate'er of earthly bliss	—	—	—	210	440
Benjamin Beddome . .	Witness ye men and angels now	—	—	—	—	239
(6). HYMNS WRITTEN BY ROMAN CATHOLICS.						
F. W. Faber	Sweet Saviour bless us ere we go	30	85	28	18	338
,, ,, ...	O come and mourn with me a while	122	247	114	130	89
,, ,, ...	Hark, hark, my soul	—	602	223	265	485
John Henry Newman .	Lead, kindly light, amid th' encircling gloom	409	565	266	401	512
,, ,, .	Praise to the Holiest in the height	487	635	172	—	—
(7). HYMNS WRITTEN BY MORAVIANS.						
John Cennick (in part) .	Lo He comes	69	115	51	52	1
,, ,, ...	Children of the Heavenly King .	342	—	—	323	449
William Hammond . .	Awake and sing the song . . .	335	—	—	369	463
James Montgomery . .	Angels from the realms of glory .	76	—	—	62	24
,, ,, .	Go to dark Gethsemane . . .	370	43	110	126	86
,, ,, . .	For ever with the Lord	363	—	231	252	489
,, ,, .	Hail to the Lord's anointed . .	379	179	219	89	34
,, ,, . .	Songs of praise the angels sang .	503	—	297	374	422
,, ,, . .	Lord, pour Thy Spirit from on high	253	421	355	396	270
Nicolaus Zinzendorf . .	O Thou, to whose all-searching sight	460	—	—	106	62
,, ,, . . .	Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness	—	—	—	207	480

(8). HYMNS GENERALLY IDENTIFIED WITH THE METHODIST MOVEMENT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

		Church Hymns.	The Hymnary.	Hymns Ancient and Modern.	Hymnal Companion.	American Church Hymnal.
Robert Seagrave . . .	Rise my soul and stretch thy wings	—	—	—	—	447
Augustus M. Toplady .	Rock of ages cleft for me . . .	490	386	184	110	391
Charles Wesley . . .	Hark, the herald angels sing . .	80	145	60	61	17
,, ,, (in part)	Lo He comes, with clouds descending	69	115	51	52	1
,, ,, . . .	Christ the Lord is risen to-day .	134	266	131	138	98
,, ,, . . .	Soldiers of Christ arise . . .	501	619	270	233	216
,, ,, . . .	Forth in Thy name, O Lord, I go	6	60	8	8	318
,, ,, . . .	Christ, whose glory fills the skies	4	58	7	6	331
,, ,, . . .	Jesu, lover of my soul	396	562	193	116	393
,, ,, . . .	Love divine all love excelling .	430	—	—	221	456
,, ,, . . .	O for a heart to praise my God .	466	—	—	227	467
,, ,, . . .	Rejoice, the Lord is king . . .	488	—	202	378	—
William Williams . .	Guide me, O Thou great Redeemer	376	—	196	237	505
Thomas Olivers . . .	The God of Abraham praise . .	511	—	—	386	141
,, ,, . . .	Hail thou once despised Jesus .	378	—	—	135	76
William Cowper . . .	Hark, my soul, it is the Lord .	—	—	260	223	521
,, ,, . . .	O for a closer walk with God .	—	—	—	336	435
,, ,, . . .	God of our life, to Thee we call .	258	—	374	329	446
,, ,, . . .	God moves in a mysterious way .	257	—	373	211	502
John Newton	Glorious things of Thee are spoken	368	601	—	214	190
,, ,, ...	How sweet the name of Jesus sounds	387	603	176	217	395
,, ,, ...	Day of judgment, day of wonders	—	—	—	53	481
T. Haweis	O Thou from whom all goodness flows	459	583	283	100	65
Rowland Hill	Lo, round the throne a glorious band	—	408	435	262	—
Thos. Kelly (19th century)	Through the day Thy love hath spared us	31	91	25	20	342
,, ,, ...	Come, see the place where Jesus lay	—	—	139	—	102
,, ,, ...	The head that once was crowned with thorns	—	623	301	153	114
,, ,, ...	We sing the praise of Him who died	542	—	200	129	78

APPENDIX B.—See p. 41.

The French Pastor, to whose statement I have referred, is M. Eugène Bersier. I have since been in correspondence with M. Bersier upon the subject, and the following is an extract from one of his letters :—

. . . . "Appelé à célébrer continuellement des enterrements dans nos cimetières de Paris, je me suis fait un devoir de recueiller aussi exactement que possible auprès des Ordonnateurs des Pompes funèbres des renseignements précis sur le nombre des enterrements purement civils. Je suis heureux de déclarer, d'après leur témoignage, que ce nombre est comparativement très restreint.

"Dans l'Ouest de Paris, il monte à deux ou trois par cent., et dans les quartiers tout-à-fait populaires, on estime qu'il ne dépasse pas cinq par cent. J'ajoute que mon impression sur ce point est partagé par mes collégues dans le ministère.

"Au reste, il peut être intéressant de citer, sur ce point, le journal *La République Française*, organe d'un parti très nettement positiviste et anti-réligieux. Il disait le 20 Septembre dernier :—

"'Décréter maintenant, sans aucune provocation du clergé paroissial, la suppression du budget des cultes, ce serait heurter de front l'opinion publique. *Ils sont très rares, en effet, même parmi les libres-penseurs, les hommes qui entendent se passer entièrement du clergé, ne fût-ce que pour la première communion de leurs enfants.*'

"EUG. BERSIER."

APPENDIX C.—See pp. 148–191.

CANTERBURY CLERICAL EDUCATION FUND.

Committee.

THE EARL SONDES.
RT. HON. A. J. B. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.
J. G. TALBOT, ESQ., M.P.
H. A. BRASSEY, ESQ., M.P.
R. NORTON, ESQ.
E. H. SCOTT, ESQ.
THE BISHOP OF DOVER.
THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.
THE ARCHDEACON OF MAIDSTONE.
REV. CANON ROBERTSON.
REV. CANON JEFFREYS.
REV. CANON JENKINS.
REV. CANON SCOTT ROBERTSON.
REV. CANON ELWYN.
REV. J. S. HOARE.

TREASURER.
REV. CANON ERSKINE KNOLLYS, Wrotham Rectory, Sevenoaks.

HON. SECRETARY.
REV. CANON MOORE, The Precincts, Canterbury.

Bankers.

Messrs. HAMMOND & Co., Canterbury.
Messrs. WIGAN & Co., Maidstone.

The object of the Fund—founded by the Diocesan Conference of 1877, under the sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury—is to contribute towards the education of candidates for Holy Orders, resident in, or connected with the Diocese of Canterbury, whose private means are insufficient for the purpose, but who may be recommended as thoroughly deserving of assistance.

Grants, not exceeding £80 annually for three years in any one case, are paid subject to Terminal certificates of good conduct and diligence.

The Committee earnestly appeal for increased support, without which they will be compelled to reject the applications of some very promising candidates for University education, with a view to seeking Holy Orders.

The Fund, if duly supported, will have the two-fold good effect of raising the position of deserving men, and of adding to the supply of candidates for Ordination, still very far short of the demand.

The Committee will be influenced by no party views in administering the Funds committed to their charge; and sincerely hope that, by additional Offertories, donations, and annual subscriptions, their hands may be strengthened for the fulfilment of a work so beneficial to individuals, and so important to the Church in general.

Grants have already been made in five cases, the payment of which began at Easter, 1879, and will close at Midsummer, 1884. As regards one-half of the gross amount however the Committee have been obliged to *trust* that the necessary Funds, not yet provided, may be supplied in time by the liberality of members of the Church. Meanwhile they feel themselves precluded from incurring any further responsibilities until their funds have been materially increased.

A Clergyman offers £100, to meet nine other similar contributions, as the foundation of an invested fund, or small endowment, the interest only of which shall be available for expenditure.

APPENDIX D.—See p. 197.

The 18th section of the Act 29 & 30 Vict., cap. 111., is as follows :—

"When the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are or may be in receipt of any income arising from estates that belong or have belonged to any dean or chapter, or any major or minor corporation of any cathedral or collegiate church, the said Commissioners shall be at liberty (whether an Order of Her Majesty in Council has or has not been passed in relation to such income, and notwithstanding any limitation contained in any Act of Parliament as to the stipends and allowances of any of the persons herein-after mentioned) out of such income to make such provision as to them may seem needful for securing adequate stipends and allowances to the minor canons, schoolmasters, organists, vicars choral, lay clerks, officers, choristers, bedesmen, servants, and other members of the cathedral or collegiate church, and for securing adequate sums of money for the maintenance of any existing college or school in connexion with the cathedral or collegiate church."

APPENDIX E.

CONFIRMATIONS DURING THE LAST ELEVEN YEARS.

Held principally by the Bishop of Dover as Suffragan.

Year.	Candidates.		Total.	Number of Confirmations.
	Male.	Female.		
1869	...	...	7,481	41
1870	1,825	2,493	4,318	34
1871	2,353	3,680	6,033	78
1872	2,538	3,075	5,613	78
1873	1,980	3,256	5,236	85
1874	1,886	2,958	4,844	70
1875	2,428	3,807	6,235	107
1876	2,063	3,165	5,228	85
1877	2,198	3,599	5,797	93
1878	2,432	3,785	6,217	99
1879	2,027	3,462	5,489	83

114135
Tait, Archibald Campbell, Archbp. of Canterbury
The Church of the future...
RTheol
T

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 13 15 03 05 031 0